The Perpetuity of the Seventh-day Sabbath



Joseph Harvey Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS 5
PREFACE 6
DEBATE 7
- FIRST SPEECH 7
- SECOND SPEECH 9
- THIRD SPEECH 16
- FOURTH SPEECH 21
- FIFTH SPEECH 26
- SIXTH SPEECH 30
- SEVENTH SPEECH 35
- EIGHTH SPEECH 39
- NINTH SPEECH 44
- TENTH SPEECH 48
- ELEVENTH SPEECH 54
- TWELFTH SPEECH 58
- THIRTEENTH SPEECH 64
- FOURTEENTH SPEECH 67
- FIFTEENTH SPEECH 71
- SIXTEENTH SPEECH 74
- SEVENTEENTH SPEECH 78
- EIGHTEENTH SPEECH 82
- NINETEENTH SPEECH 86
- TWENTIETH SPEECH 89
- TWENTY-FIRST SPEECH 93
- TWENTY-SECOND SPEECH 96
- TWENTY-THIRD SPEECH 100
- TWENTY-FOURTH SPEECH 103
- TWENTY-FIFTH SPEECH 107
- TWENTY-SIXTH SPEECH 111
- AFTERNOON OF THE LAST DAY 115
- TWENTY-SEVENTH SPEECH 116
- TWENTY-EIGHTH SPEECH 120
- TWENTY-NINTH SPEECH 124
- THIRTIETH SPEECH 127
- THIRTY-FIRST SPEECH 132

DEBATE ON THE SABBATH 137
- QUESTION DEBATED 138

THE PERPETUITY OF THE SEVENTH-DAY SABBATH.

REPORT OF A DEBATE ON THE SABBATH QUESTIO BETWEEN J. M. STEVENSON AND J. H. WAGGONER.

AT CRANE'S GROVE, STEPHENSON COUNTY, ILL., AUGUS 1858 FORESTON, ILL.:

PUBLISHED BY J. M. STEVENSON AND H. COLLINGS.

1859.

HENRY R. BOSS,

Book and Job Printer, Advertiser Office, Polo, Ill.

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This report of a debate between J. H. Waggoner and J. M. Stevenson has material by both men, as indicated throughout the document.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
DEBATE	5
DEBATE ON THE SABBATH	121

PREFACE

We present this debate to the public on the subject of the seventh day (Sabbath.) being binding on Christians during this dispensation, with much pleasure, believing it will help the lovers of Bible truth to a right understanding of this all important subject—for if Prophets, Apostles or Christ have commanded us to keep the seventh day (Sabbath.) we should know it—if not, then we never should teach what we never were commanded to teach.*PSDS 3.1*

We would here say that our reporter has done much better than could have been expected, and we doubt exceedingly whether a long experienced reporter could have done better. Therefore, much credit is due to him, for he has gone far beyond our expectations in the correctness of his report of the debate, and all will readily see this from the harmony which exists between the report of our stenographer and Eld. R. Chowan's report from his notes taken at the time of the debate. And we would also say that Eld. R. Chowan, before and at the debate, was very strongly leaning towards Sabbatarianism, so much so that it was reported that he had embraced the doctrine. He came to the debate with a desire to know the truth if possible. Therefore, we publish his report which will be found at the end of this work. We would therefore request the readers to compare the reports together. which will strongly prove the correctness of our stenographer's report of the discussion. We do not hesitate to commend it to the public as a true exhibition of facts and arguments used by the parties on the question debated. We think, also, that Eld. J. H. Waggoner has done justice to the proposition, and if he has not proved it, it is not because he lacked the ability to do so.*PSDS 3.2*

J. M. STEPHENSON.

H. COLLINGS.

DEBATE

FIRST SPEECH

Note.—This is fragmentary in consequence of my arriving on the ground too late to hear more than a small part of it.*PSDS 5.1*

E. L. COLBY, Reporter.*PSDS 5.2*

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—It is an important part of this investigation that we settle first principles, and therefore, most of this first hour of the discussion has been taken up in so doing.*PSDS 5.3*

It is important that we find the reason why the Lord sanctified the Sabbath, for, it will be readily admitted by my opponent, that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was so sanctified. This fact of its sanctification has never been reversed. I have never found one expression showing that this fact has been reversed.*PSDS 5.4*

But we have made reference to the *16th chapter* of Exodus, commencing at the *4th verse*: "Then said the Lord unto Moses, behold I will rain bread from Heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law or no." Here we find a reference to the law of the Lord, and this was to "prove them," whether they would walk in that law; that is, whether they would be obedient to the law of the Lord. Then in *verse 21* it says, "they gathered it every morning," etc., and *verse 22nd*, "on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread," and so on. Then *verse 23rd* , "This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Now, we must believe that this was before the children of Israel came to Sinai, and therefore, previous to the promulgation of the ten commandments. "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord," and what would to-morrow be? If we know anything about scripture facts that "to-morrow" would be the "seventh day." Now let us go back and look at the record again. God "blessed the seventh day," and God "rested on the seventh day." The "to-morrow" would be the seventh day, and the seventh day would be the rest day, from the fact that God rested on that

day. He hallowed it or sanctified it, therefore, from the creation.*PSDS 5.5*

In the *24th and 25th verses* it says, “And they laid it up till the morning as Moses bade,” etc. “And Moses said eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord,” and here, in the fourth commandment, “but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,” etc. “And the Lord said unto Moses, how long refuse ye to keep my commandments and the law.” Now, if I can draw any conclusion, it is that Moses has declared that the seventh day was the Sabbath of the Lord, and that it was a transgression of the law of God not to observe that day, and that obligation reached back to creation.*PSDS 6.1*

We have established the position that God rested on the seventh day, and that day was the Sabbath. We have got the important declaration that the Sabbath was made at creation, and that it was a holy institution, and not only did the ground of the obligation itself exist at that time, but the obligation was recognized, and, inasmuch as God blessed the seventh day, it was a violation of His law to break the Sabbath, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was a sacred day. They must keep that day “holy unto the Lord,” for upon it the Lord rested, and from the express consideration that the Lord rested upon that day, He sanctified it. For that reason the Lord blessed the seventh day.*PSDS 6.2*

The first part of the issue is before you. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation.*PSDS 6.3*

SECOND SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—In the first place allow me to remark that I am willing to do as I would be done by, and therefore, if in the course of this discussion, my opponent should lack a few moments at the close of any speech, of having time enough to express his ideas, let him have it, I shall wish the same privilege extended to me.*PSDS 6.4*

I can, with all my heart, indorse all the preliminary statements of my opponent, as well as the sentiments expressed in the opening prayer.*PSDS 7.1*

I hail this auspicious morn with delight. I have long desired to see the day when there would be a fair and thorough investigation of this question, and while I can but deprecate my own want of ability to do justice to my side of the argument, I am still glad of the opportunity presented to meet my opponent. Though I do not, and shall not feel worthy to redeem the trust reposed in me by friends, I am still willing to go forth, with the armor of truth, and engage in the argument.*PSDS 7.2*

As I before remarked, much that my opponent has said I can fully indorse. But the question is that the Sabbath was made at creation, and it gives my opponent a chance to try to prove the affirmative. As to whether he has shown it to be true, will be seen in the sequel. It is one thing to make an assertion, and quite another to prove that assertion to be true.*PSDS 7.3*

He says the reason why the Lord sanctified the Sabbath must be shown. This reason is given in *Exodus 20:11*, instead of the 10th verse, as Elder Waggoner has stated.*PSDS 7.4*

My opponent has proved the fact of the creation of heaven and earth to be perpetual and eternal. This I will not deny.*PSDS 7.5*

There are so few points of difference in this first speech, that I do not know as I shall be able to consume all my hour in the reply, but one proposition I wish to notice, is the statement that the original and only reason given for keeping the Sabbath, was that God created heaven and earth in six days and rested the seventh day.

This would have been true if he had not appended the exclusive adverb “only.” It was a reason, but not “the only” reason. He has stumbled at the very first step. He gives the general reason and ignores the specific one, which was, that God brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the house of bondage. This fact will be perpetual and eternal also. One word as to the record given by Moses. I believe he was a faithful witness.*PSDS 7.6*

I have said there was a specific reason for the observance of the fourth commandment, Sabbath, and I will prove it from the 15th v. of the *5th ch.* of Deuteronomy: “And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.” Is not this a reason? If it is, does it conflict with the reason given by my opponent? I indorse the general reason; will he indorse the specific? This reason not only limits but localizes the fourth commandment. While I freely admit his as a general reason, will he admit mine as a specific one? From this specific reason, it follows that the obligation enjoined in the fourth commandment was limited to one people, and was subsequent to their deliverance from the house of bondage. As long as God exists it will be a fact that he created heaven and earth in six days and rested on the seventh. The fact may exist a million of years, may exist forever. But it is the origin of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment with which we have to do. I admit the fact that God rested on the seventh day, but will the obligation to observe that day, as a Sabbath, exist through all eternity because the fact exists? By no means. God’s resting on the seventh day was a reason, but not the “only” reason. That was a general reason. The specific reason was that God delivered the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage*PSDS 7.7*

There is one thing that I am conscious of being, and that is an honest man up to this point. I can endorse Elder Waggoner’s reason, but not all of his language.*PSDS 8.1*

It seems to me he avoids the real question at issue, but I shall wait. The real point I shall not move just now, as I do not wish to anticipate him in his arguments.*PSDS 8.2*

Several times he declared that the creation is an eternal fact, and beyond the reach of God's power to abrogate. This I admit as well as the fact of God's resting on the seventh day, which is an eternal and immutable fact.*PSDS 8.3*

"Sabbath and rest signify the same." No issue between us here. "The Lord's Sabbath was the Lord's rest-day." My opponent says "turn to *Exodus 20:8* v. If the phrases Sabbath and Rest signify the same, the Sabbath-day and Rest-day would be the same."*PSDS 8.4*

I do not wish this dispute to consist of a mere bandying of words, and therefore, where there is no difference between us, I shall not take issue.*PSDS 8.5*

"The creation of heaven and earth eternal" again. I will admit it as an eternal fact, and hope that my repeated admissions will satisfy my opponent. He remarked that "God blessed the rest-day because He rested from his work." The phrase "the rest-day" wants something to qualify it. It should be "the Lord's rest-day." "The seventh day was not blessed because He made heaven and earth, but because He rested." No issue here. "God blessed and sanctified the seventh day because He rested." I want to reach a point where I can make an application of this admission. I indorse nearly all the statements my opponent has made up to this point. I do not wish to anticipate him in my first speech.*PSDS 9.1*

The reason why God rested on the seventh day, and the reason why man was to observe it as a Sabbath are two different things, notwithstanding my opponent thinks he has "dug to the rock" in calling them the same.*PSDS 9.2*

"The Sabbath was made for man," and set apart for the observance of man at creation, my opponent says, because God rested on that day, sanctified and made it holy; but he must travel over four thousand years from the time of God's resting, etc., to the New Testament declaration, and this he does at a single leap. He thinks he has proved to you that the "Sabbath was made for man," because God rested on that day, but, did God call the seventh day on which He rested from the creation of heaven and earth, holy? Did He call the Sabbath of the fourth commandment holy because

He rested on that day? It was because He blessed and sanctified that day, and not because He rested on it.*PSDS 9.3*

“Why was the Sabbath of the fourth commandment called holy? Because God rested on that day at creation.” This, my opponent says, is the only reason he shall give throughout this discussion. “Because God rested on that day.” He supposes so, let him prove it from the scriptures and one important point is gained.*PSDS 9.4*

Turn to the *23 ch.* of Leviticus and you will find many feast days, all called Sabbaths of the Lord, as I shall prove. Now I do not wish to anticipate in the argument, but why were the festival sabbaths called holy? Why were they called rests? Because the Lord feasted and rested. Were they called sabbaths because the people had rested? or because the Lord had commanded the people to feast and to rest? The latter I think the most reasonable, because the Lord commanded the people to observe those days, and not because they had observed them.*PSDS 9.5*

It is a principle in logic that an argument proving too much, proves nothing, and I think my opponent’s argument proves too much, according to these applications.*PSDS 10.1*

It is a fact that the Lord planted a garden, and that fact will exist to all eternity; but does that prove that the garden itself will exist to all eternity?*PSDS 10.2*

Just in the same way it is proved that precepts will exist to all eternity, because the facts upon which they are based will thus exist. Will the existence of facts give permanency to the obligation or precept growing out of them? There is nothing to be deducted from such a flimsy premise.*PSDS 10.3*

Exodus 16:23 v. Now where had the Lord said “to-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord?” “At the creation,” says my opponent; but did he prove it? He found nothing about “to-morrow” at the creation, but he did find the “seventh day.” So he puts the seventh day of one passage with the seventh day of another, and calls them the same. But where the context fully explains and illustrates the text, my opponent should not digress from it. There is nothing here to show that the “to-morrow” was the seventh day on

which the Lord rested. It was the seventh day from the giving of the manna. No reference is made to the creation week. A mere coincidence of words does not prove the coincidence of days. The "to-morrow" of the text was the day after the sixth; therefore it was the seventh day, and it is here called "a holy Sabbath unto the Lord," but, remember it was the seventh day after giving of the manna, and we have no proof that it was the day on which God rested from the creation. It could not be the identical twenty-four hours.*PSDS 10.4*

I n *v. 27* we find that the people went out in violation of this commandment and found no manna. "And the Lord said unto Moses, how long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" Now we admit that in this, as in all cases, a law must be given before it can be violated. But what need of going back to creation as my opponent does? It almost seems that he can only see two points, and they are the creation and the giving of the fourth commandment. Why go back beyond Egyptian bondage to find a reason for this law? Because, just take time out of the obligation and there is no obligation there, and my opponent knows it. He has given you the particulars with reference to two days. The Sabbath of the text was given to the children of Israel after their deliverance from Egypt, and my opponent claims that it was given to them 2500 years before; but, could that have been the reason of their receiving twice as much bread on the sixth day? God could not give that people a Sabbath before they existed. Is not this "a nail in a sure place?"*PSDS 10.5*

[Here Mr. Stephenson got to talking in "double quick time," or at the rate of about 200 words a minute, and therefore the report is imperfect, for which I am sorry.—Reporter.]*PSDS 11.1*

There are two points between which the Sabbath must have been given, i.e., creation and the giving of the law at Sinai, after they had been brought from Egyptian bondage. Read the law regulating the gathering of manna, *v. 4*. They were to gather twice as much on the sixth day. This law goes just as far back as the wilderness of sin.*PSDS 11.2*

They gathered twice as much on the sixth day. Some of the rulers

came and told Moses “that the people had violated his commandments,” No.; for they had obeyed this commandment of God, as communicated to Moses, *Exodus 16:5*. Now, said Moses, “this is what the Lord hath said, to-morrow is the Sabbath unto the Lord,” *22 and 23 verses*. Does Moses tell the truth or not? An inspired man should always tell the truth. The Lord must have said so at that time, and not at creation. The Lord did say so at the time, and did not refer back to the creation, as my opponent did. Did the Lord give that people the Sabbath at creation? Were they required to observe it because it was given to them at creation? I call upon Elder Waggoner to prove when the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was given to man, if it was not at the time the fourth commandment itself was given. Where? at what time? before the children of Israel entered the wilderness of sin? Was the Sabbath of the fourth commandment given to them? Its observance was enjoined in connection with the giving of the manna, but God does not intimate, Moses does not intimate that it was to be observed by man, or had been observed by him before that time. It was given at the wilderness of sin, and commemorates the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. This is evident from the specific reason for its observance, before quoted from *Deuteronomy 5:15*. It is agreed that obligation and precept go hand in hand, but obligation between child and parent cannot be shown before child and parent exist. Why did God command them to observe a Sabbath at all? Because God brought them out of the land of Egypt. The commandment itself grew out of the Lord’s delivering the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. With the fourth commandment this Sabbath must stand or fall.*PSDS 11.3*

This specific reason will also appear from *Exodus 31:17*. “It is a sign between me and the children of Israel.” The time when the Sabbath was ordained, and the time it ceased to exist, the two great points of the discussion, are here clearly shown. Let us not fight at swords’ points. Let every body see and hear our arguments. With all my heart I say, I indorse the idea expressed in the prayer that truth may prevail. If the words or arguments of either disputant are not the truth, let him be vanquished. But about the time. I refer to the ch. last mentioned, commencing at the *13th v.* “Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations.” “Between me and you.” So says the scripture, and it

cannot be applied, at least not justly applied to anybody else. “Throughout your generations.” Not everybody, but “your.” Next verse, “for it is holy unto you.” Who now can say that the Gentiles should observe it when it is here expressly declared to be a sign between God and the children of Israel? We think we have proved that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment originated in the wilderness of sin. Elder Waggoner thinks he has proved it to have originated on the day God rested from the creation of heaven and earth. Both positions cannot be true. That would be impossible.*PSDS 12.1*

Again, in *Deuteronomy 4:13*: “And He declared unto you his covenant which He commanded you to perform, even the ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.” By the fourth commandment we mean the fourth of the ten, and they are God’s covenant with the children of Israel, (and with no other people,) made at Mount Sinai.*PSDS 12.2*

THIRD SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—We need not introduce the subject to you by any remarks. Elder Stephenson has said that he was glad there was so many points upon which he could agree with us. We do not claim an agreement to all his admissions. Indeed we believe the converse of some of them to be true.*PSDS 13.1*

He led out and anticipated positions which he supposed I might take or would take. He has gone entirely beyond me. He has been considering the last part of the question in dispute, and that is a point at which I had not arrived. I had only taken the first part of the issue. I did not endeavor to establish the precept, and I am not bound to follow him in all the arguments he has adduced on this point, and prove them false. I have not got to that part of the subject. The preliminaries are indorsed, and then the question is raised whether I have met the issue. The main issue will be the time when the Sabbath originated, and then the question of its observance afterwards.*PSDS 13.2*

God rested on the seventh day, and this is the ground of the institution, and the argument is based on the institution. But mark, he says there is a "specific" reason given in the *5th ch. of Deut.*, and that is because the Lord brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; and then the question is raised, does the general reason supercede the specific one? He admits that my reason is a general one, and, I ask, does the specific reason, which follows the general one, in any way supercede that general reason? My question is, I think, as pertinent as his. In order to "read" the force of this, he has led out and stated positions that the conditions of the discussion or progress of the debate will not warrant, and which do not militate against what I had said. There is a general reason, then, for the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, but, he has gone on to show that the specific reason localizes and limits the observance of the precept to the children of Israel.*PSDS 13.3*

But what was that seventh day? My opponent is very tenacious that it was the seventh day from the falling of the manna, and he don't wish me to leave the context. It seems I don't argue exactly to suit him, but this I cannot help.*PSDS 13.4*

[Here the *14th ch. of Deut.* is referred to, but I cannot see the application made of any passage taken from it.—Reporter.]*PSDS 14.1*

Exodus 34th, etc. It is a sign and a peculiar sign, especially to that people.*PSDS 14.2*

[I cannot exactly get the connection of the passages here referred to, with the remarks made upon them. The verse is omitted and I am not at liberty to supply it.—Reporter.]*PSDS 14.3*

We have not turned to the passages referred to, but the substance of them is that the Sabbath was a sign.*PSDS 14.4*

Can we identify this seventh day? Let us see if we can prove it to be the same on which the Lord rested after the creation. “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the seventh day He rested.” This my opponent seems to have overlooked. By a comparison of this with *Exodus 16th*, we prove that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was the identical seventh day on which the Lord rested. My proposition was to prove that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment originated at the creation, but my opponent says it originated at the wilderness of sin. And he is bringing in another affirmative question against the affirmative question presented for our discussion. He makes the admission that I have given a general reason for the setting apart of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment; therefore the seventh day is the Sabbath, and because the Sabbath was the seventh day of the creation, it was set apart. This he admits to be the general reason. Does his “specific” reason destroy the general one? We have his admission. If he wishes to make such an issue he can argue alone. His admission we wish you to mark, and also that he has said nothing to go against the point I had proved. He says, and truly too, that this is an arrangement, by Moses, of the ten commandments that God had given to the children of Israel on Mount Sinai. We shall in the course of the discussion, have something to do with the observance of the fourth commandment Sabbath, by other people than the children of Israel, but this is not the time to introduce it as we are now on the first part of the proposition under consideration.*PSDS 14.5*

But here is a reason, he urges, that limits and localizes the fourth commandment injunction, and shows it to have been made subsequent to the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. In reply I would ask, why was the seventh day sanctified? Why was the seventh day chosen in preference to any other day? “Keep the seventh day as the Lord has commanded thee.” The Sabbath then must have been given previously, or the Lord would not have commanded them to keep it. “In it thou shalt do no work,” etc., that is in the seventh day. Why was the seventh day chosen to be sanctified? The only reason that can be given, was that God rested on that day after the creation. There has been nothing brought forward by my opponent that militates against this position. Even my opponent’s admission goes to strengthen our arguments.*PSDS 15.1*

Why is the seventh day denominated the rest-day? I can bring testimonies plainly pointing out that God recognized or recognizes the seventh day as the Sabbath or rest-day; because on that day He rested when He had made heaven and earth.*PSDS 15.2*

But I wish to make another point just now, and therefore, I would refer to *Deuteronomy 6:24* v.*PSDS 15.3*

[The 10th and 16th verses are also referred to, but I cannot see any connection with the subject, so I leave them out of the report, thinking they might have been named by mistake.—Reporter.]*PSDS 15.4*

“And the Lord commanded us to do all these statutes, to fear the Lord our God, for our good always, that he might preserve us alive, as it is at this day.” As you perceive, I can show from this scripture that the fear of God is based upon the same specific reason named by my worthy opponent, viz., that God brought them out of the land of Egypt. Will Elder Stephenson carry his logic as far as it will carry him? Will he claim that the same specific reason exists for an observance of the injunction to fear God that applies in the case of the fourth commandment Sabbath? Will not his “principle of logic that an argument proving too much proves nothing,” apply to his “specific reason” argument? I think it will. If his specific reason holds, then no man is under obligation to fear God except he has

been delivered from Egyptian bondage. Will Elder Stephenson acknowledge the position to which his “specific” reasoning has led him?*PSDS 15.5*

Let us apply it to another passage. Take *Deuteronomy 24:17, 18* verses. “Thou shall not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take the widow’s raiment to pledge; but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; therefore I command thee to do this thing.” Now it follows as a legitimate, and I might say “logical” conclusion, on the principle of my opponent’s argument, that if any one had not been a “bondman in Egypt” and redeemed thence as stated in the text, then he could do all these things so expressly prohibited by the word of God. The same course of reasoning would prove that all those who then lived on the face of the earth, and those who had lived before the deliverance from Egyptian bondage could do those things that are here expressly forbidden, with impunity. How would my opponent bind any injunction of God upon other nations? The same local and specific reason would apply to any obligatory commandment. Will he claim that none were required to keep the commandments “Thou shalt not kill,” “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor,” and so on; except they were first brought out of the land of Egypt?—except they had been delivered from Egyptian bondage? I will take the same position with regard to every one of the ten Commandments, as well as all of God’s Old Testament Laws. Will my opponent come up and face his own “logic?”*PSDS 16.1*

But, can we keep the creation Sabbath? We cannot keep the identical day on which God rested after the creation, for that day is in the past, but we can keep a day answering to that day. Just as we celebrate the fourth of July every year. We do not observe the same day, A. D. 1776, on which our forefathers first proclaimed the Declaration of Independence to the world, but it is a day answering to that day. This is another local and specific memorial. I wanted to call your attention to these points because they may be brought up by my opponent to militate against my position or arguments.*PSDS 16.2*

Sanctification of the Sabbath. He does not take issue. I have produced testimony to show that it was sanctified at the creation, and upon it I shall rest, for the present at least, or until my opponent shakes or attempts to shake my position. He says he does not want to anticipate, but he does; and why? For the purpose of cutting off ray arguments, but he will find it of very little avail after all.*PSDS 16.3*

He does not wish to have me go back and leave the context, but the question is not when was the Sabbath made, but when was it sanctified or set apart to be observed. He would deprive me of the privilege of bringing scriptures together when they are pertinent and relevant. I am willing to have him anticipate as much as he pleases, but I claim the privilege of bringing such scripture proofs as I may see fit to the support of my positions. The truth is what we want —"God's word is truth." I wish to have my hearers mark the facts. I do not wish to have them overlooked. Irrelevant truths should not be brought into the discussion.*PSDS 17.1*

The reason of the sanctification of the seventh day is appended to the fourth commandment, in *Exodus 20:11* v. "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Now, I ask, cannot I go back to the Bible account of the creation and show an analogy of facts?*PSDS 17.2*

I am very sorry that the admissions of my opponent have so scattered his argument that I cannot take them up in the order in which they were presented. He admits the Sabbath has a general reason for its observance. We have claimed it was made at creation. The local and specific reason I am willing to admit, but I shall claim the same in regard to every other commandment without distinction or reserve.*PSDS 17.3*

FOURTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—I am always sorry to be under the necessity of anticipating an opponent, but still more so, to be obliged to confess that I have admitted the issue, as it certainly puts me in an awkward position before the audience. I beg of you all to remember that there are two sides to every question—one true and the other false. In the consideration or discussion of every subject there are usually two extremes, and between them we must strike a just medium in order to arrive at the truth.*PSDS 17.4*

"It appears from what my opponent has told you, that I launched out to prove the perpetuity of the Sabbath; that I assigned proofs, etc. In this it seems I have incurred his displeasure." But he did not confine his argument to the origin of the fourth commandment Sabbath. In the first place he made the admission that it originated at creation. Then he admits my reason also. He seems to think himself under no obligation to answer me in some cases, but if I have digressed from my proper limits in this discussion, the chairman ought to have called me to order.*PSDS 17.5*

But he admits my specific reason and still thinks the general one is the true one. Now a man may tell a portion of the truth and yet convey a wrong idea.*PSDS 18.1*

I proved that a specific and local reason limited and localized a general one. I wish the reason of the fourth commandment to be considered as not a general reason. If it was given before the children of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage, it was a general reason. If it was given subsequently, it was never a general reason.*PSDS 18.2*

He says a specific reason does not supersede a general one, hence we must admit that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is to be observed by all men, in all ages of the world. But his premise is false, and consequently his conclusion must be false also. I look at my notes and I cannot remember or see a single argument that he has advanced in support of the affirmative side of the question. We are both digressing from the issue. It is not the origin of the Sabbath of the Lord, but it is the origin of the Sabbath

of the fourth commandment that we are to discuss. The word of is a possessive preposition. The people of God are God's people. The children of God are God's children. There is not an exception to this rule.*PSDS 18.3*

I affirm that an obligation cannot antedate a commandment. We may talk about the eternity of principle as long as we please, but this has nothing to do with a moral obligation. You may apply this to earthly rulers. The principle of a law may be right, but until that law is given, no man is under obligation to observe that principle; and even though I should admit the holiness of the institution, no Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made, or could have been observed until the fourth commandment itself was given, for "where there is no law there is no transgression."*PSDS 18.4*

I understand, and we certainly should agree upon this, that the preposition of is a possessive preposition. Every work on Grammar calls it a possessive particle, and if I am wrong I pause to be corrected. All admit it. If my opponent has touched the real issue I have not seen it. I will not dispute the origin of the obligation contained in the fourth commandment, but when did the commandment enforcing this obligation originate? I will confine my arguments to this till they are answered, or at least noticed.*PSDS 19.1*

Preferred to *Exodus 16:29*, to show that the Lord gave the Sabbath at the wilderness of sin, as a corroborative testimony to *Deuteronomy 5:15*, and not to show that the Sabbath did not exist anterior to its publication on Sinai. This is a misrepresentation of my language, as well as my views, though it was undoubtedly unintentional. I do not think my opponent would intentionally misrepresent me in any particular. It most assuredly proves that the precept for man to observe the Sabbath originated after their exodus from Egypt. Again, he says, does the specific reason supersede the general one? Certainly not.*PSDS 19.2*

I deny that I admitted that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment originated at the creation. I believe that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment did not, and could not antedate the fourth commandment itself.*PSDS 19.3*

“The Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and the day on which the Lord rested from the creation, are identical.” He did not at first pretend to affirm that it was the identical day on which the Lord rested. He instances the fourth of July. My intelligent opponent will not take the position that the fourth of July which we observe, is the same identical day, A. D. 1776, on which our glorious Declaration was first proclaimed to the world. The question is, when did the Lord command that a day should be kept answering to the day on which He rested from the creation of heaven and earth? Was it when the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was enforced upon man? I affirm that not one of the ten commandments given at Mount Sinai were binding upon any man before it was enforced by precept upon man. No precept, no obligation. We never should confound things that ought to be kept separate. Now the facts are these: They must observe either the first, second, third or some other day of the week. Why was the seventh day selected in preference to any other? The reason was because the Lord rested on the seventh day. Let my opponent prove that it was because God created heaven and earth. *Deuteronomy 5th ch. 15th v.* I can believe that the reason why they were commanded to observe a Sabbath at all, was because they were delivered from Egyptian bondage. The reason why the seventh day was set apart was because the Lord rested on that day after the creation. The Bible can always be made to harmonize on the truth. The Sabbath was a sign between the Lord and the children of Israel because they were delivered from Egyptian bondage. By reference to *Exodus 16:4, 5*, the specifications in reference to all the days were there arrayed. The “to-morrow,” *verse 23rd*, was the day after the sixth, being dated from the first day of the giving of manna. The Divine reason why God gave twice as much manna on the sixth day, was the fact that he had given them, i.e., the children of Israel, the Sabbath. “See for what the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days,” *verse 29*. Let me compare the foregoing reason with my opponent’s reasoning; and get out the logic in it. “See that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath 2500 years ago; therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days.”*PSDS 19.4*

The obligation growing out of the precept recorded in *Deuteronomy 24:17, 18*, together with the principles involved in the ten, and all

other commandments, did not exist anterior to those precepts; for "where there is no law there is no transgression." This position has been admitted by my opponent a number of times. Now, I say, upon the principle of the gentleman's argument, precepts are entirely superfluous, as they neither originate nor enhance obligation. My opponent ignores the real issue that is between us. Did the duty to observe that precept exist before the precept itself existed. It is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment that we are discussing. I am very glad my opponent referred to logic, and I wish he could in some way bring a little of it to bear upon this question; but I am obliged to confess before this audience, that I cannot see the force or point of his argument. I hope I shall be more fortunate after a while. I wish to ask how could the obligation to observe the fourth commandment exist before the precept existed. Obligation and precept always go hand in hand—the former cannot antedate the latter. Will my opponent take a position contrary to this? Where there is no law there is no transgression. We shall have that remark to make many times over in the course of the discussion. We wish you all to bear it in mind.*PSDS 20.1*

Has my opponent brought a single argument to show the pre-existence or subsequent existence of the obligation to observe the precept of the fourth commandment? We do not think he has done it, or that he will be able to do it. We are making no progress in the discussion of the question before us. I hope the chairman will prevent the dragging in of things foreign to the real issue. It is the Sabbath of the precept of the fourth commandment with which we have to do. I hope my opponent will mark the fact and act accordingly.*PSDS 21.1*

[*Mark 2:27* v. From what follows I infer that this passage was quoted by Elder Waggoner, but I have no note of it, and don't know as it was so.—Reporter.]*PSDS 21.2*

He says he does not quote Jesus because he wishes to show that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is to be observed through the present age, but to show that the Sabbath was made for man at the creation. Let us look at his reasoning. "The Sabbath was made for man. The Sabbath was made at creation. Therefore the Sabbath was made for man at creation." Will not Elder Waggoner try it

again? Truly his premises are as wide as creation. I will ask my friend to assent to one principle of logic: A conclusion always grows out of a premise. Now let us look at *Mark 2:28* v. “Therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” *Verse 27th* reads in the Greek: “the Sabbath was made for the man etc. The Sabbath was made for the man. Christ Jesus, therefore—*PSDS 21.3*

FIFTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I am afraid my opponent has done that which is not lawful. It is not just for him to affirm that I believe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made for the son of man at creation. I do not say, the Bible does not say that it was made for the son of man, and his last remark was an assumption entirely unwarranted.*PSDS 21.4*

The Sabbath was made at the creation, and the Sabbath was made for man. No new elements can enter into that conclusion. Does his logic on this point amount to anything? "The Sabbath was made for man." "The Sabbath was made for *the* man." What does this prove? There is certainly no new element in the conclusion. I am unwilling to admit that the Sabbath was made for the son of man.*PSDS 22.1*

The declaration that obligation grows out of precept is wrong. There is a difference—I grant that moral obligation grows out of precept. We find a fact of a Sabbath back at creation. We find a principle existing—and to make a distinction here is making a difference that I cannot see.*PSDS 22.2*

Take the third commandment in the decalogue: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," etc. Why was that command given? Because it was wrong to take the name of God in vain. Did God's name originate with the third commandment? Certainly not; and yet, according to my opponent's reasoning, it would not have been wrong to blaspheme the name of God before the law of the ten commandments was given at Mount Sinai. So with all the rest. The principle of any or all the ten commandments of the decalogue could have been openly and continually violated by all mankind previous to the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, and no man would have been guilty of sin by so doing, for, says my opponent, "obligation and precept go hand in hand."*PSDS 22.3*

"The Lord giveth you the Sabbath 2500 years ago."*PSDS 22.4*

[This I suppose he read from his notes, so I put it in quotation, though perhaps it should be so written.—Reporter.]*PSDS 22.5*

But suppose it is limited and localized, the quotation from Exodus

and the reason given in the 5th of Deut., do not agree. They could not keep the day on which God rested from the creation, and they could not keep the day on which they were delivered out of the land of Egypt, but God gave them a day answering to that on which He rested, and told them to remember that they were bondmen in the land of Egypt, etc. The fourth commandment enjoins the observance of that day as a relative duty.*PSDS 22.6*

My opponent says there is a distinction to be made between the reason why a certain day was set apart and the reason why it was to be observed as a Sabbath unto the Lord. We will read the 5th of Deut. *14th v.* The Sabbath of the Lord is the same as the rest of the Lord. It is our duty to keep the Sabbath, and our duty to keep the rest of the Lord. And it is a mere evasion to say that we cannot keep the day upon which the Lord rested. By the declaration of the holy scriptures we find that the seventh day was sanctified, and that day was the day upon which the Lord rested. I deny that a limited and local reason encroaches in any way upon a general one. Now there is a specific reason for our meeting every year to celebrate the fourth of July. There may be many specific reasons applying to individuals or communities, but the general reason is not thereby destroyed. It is not touched. So with the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. The general reason for its observance is because God rested on that day. God may have given a specific reason to the children of Israel, but that does not destroy the general one. The observance of the seventh day was enjoined upon them because God rested on that day. God sanctified it and set it apart for man. Now if my opponent admits my premises, my conclusion is correct, for he says it is a principle of logic that “a conclusion always grows out of a premise.*PSDS 22.7*

He says the question is not the Sabbath of the Lord, but the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. We have shown that the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord, but he says the question is upon the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. But the fourth commandment says that the Sabbath is the Sabbath of the Lord. Now will not my opponent apply a little of his logical reasoning here, and show us how we are in error?*PSDS 23.1*

But he thinks the Sabbath of the fourth commandment must

commence when the fourth commandment commences, when, the fact is, it is the Sabbath of the Lord which is enjoined in the fourth commandment. It is the Sabbath of the Lord, and it was the Sabbath of the Lord before the fourth commandment was given. I admit that the question is about the origin of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, but the identity of the two is the same. The Sabbath of the Lord and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment are identical. Why does God call it a holy day. Because it was holy before the commandments were given at Mount Sinai.*PSDS 23.2*

I do not see any reason why they could not keep a Sabbath of 2500 years' standing if my opponent does. Then he tries to answer my argument in this way: "The Lord gave you the Sabbath 2500 years ago; therefore he gives you the bread of two days on the sixth, etc." My friends, that is his own declaration. No commandment exists till the obligation to observe it exists, but I shall show that it is not so.*PSDS 23.3*

The book of Genesis is a book of history, and the book of Exodus is a book of law.*PSDS 24.1*

I will now proceed to an examination of the *4th and 5th chapters* of Deut. The point that we want to introduce is the classification of these ten commandments of the decalogue as a complete code of law. It is affirmed that it is never called a law, and that there is no such declaration made in respect to it. I will call your attention to some scripture on this subject. *Exodus 24:12* v. Here God was going to call Moses up into the Mount that he might give him a law. Then in *Deuteronomy 4:12, 13* verses. Now Moses is here referring back to past events. "—saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice."—and Mount Sinai was altogether in smoke, etc., etc. Here was the burning of the Mount that Moses referred to. "I am the Lord thy God, etc." The mountain burned with fire, etc.*PSDS 24.2*

[This is a jumble of quotations and remarks that I can't see head nor tail to! Guess he was trying to find something, and so kept reading and talking alternately to fill up the time.—Reporter.]*PSDS 24.3*

5th ch. 14th v. "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," etc. And the reason why they were commanded to observe that day was because God rested on that day after the creation of

heaven and earth *4 ch. 13th v.* Now the position that I take is, that the word covenant has two significations, and one signification of it is a law. The other is a condition stated by the Lord to the children of Israel. *Exodus 19:5* v. Here it is shown to be a condition, by the keeping of which, the house of Jacob were to be a peculiar treasure unto God, above all people. But the word covenant has two significations, as we set out to show, and one of them is a law. *Exodus 31:18* v. Now how much was there in that covenant? The ten commandments. Anything more? No. They were written by the finger of God and they were a complete law, and a complete covenant with the children of Israel. They did not see God, but they heard a voice, etc. One of these commandments is the fourth, the Sabbath of which we are considering, and I would like to see how you would note a distinction between the Sabbath of the Lord and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. You might with equal propriety argue that the Sabbath of the Lord did not exist, as that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment did not, for I have shown them to be identical.*PSDS 24.4*

Other scriptures will come up to show that the ten commandments were the law of God that he wrote upon tables of stone.*PSDS 25.1*

We have not time to take up a chain of evidence to establish this point. The point we wish to make is founded upon *1 Chronicles 26th*. The word covenant has two significations. It has more, but I claim two in this connection.*PSDS 25.2*

The Sabbath of the fourth commandment dates farther back than the giving of the law at Mount Sinai. The confirmation*PSDS 25.3*

[That word is a little doubtful in my phonographic report, but I venture to “render” it as above.—Reporter.]*PSDS 25.4*

of the law goes back to the Abrahamic promise. We will not antedate thus by assumption, but by the scriptures.*PSDS 25.5*

SIXTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—We get along too fast for the reporter, but not very fast in the argument.*PSDS 25.6*

The first remark of my opponent was an answer to a criticism on *Mark 2:27, 28* verses. He denies the justness of the criticism because the word "son" was not added. He says "I do not say the Bible does not say that the Sabbath was made for the son of man." How remarkably fair he was in making this statement. "The Sabbath was made for man; the Sabbath was made at creation; therefore the Sabbath was made for man at creation." How does he make this connection between premise and conclusion? He might just as fairly have said thus: "The Sabbath was made for man; the Sabbath was made for man at creation; therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." There is his logic. Again, I ask, how does he connect his premise and conclusion? Are they analogous? Is not my opponent doing that which is not lawful—the very crime with which he charged me?*PSDS 25.7*

[Mr. Stephenson was here called to order by the chairman for the affirmative. The chairman for the negative sustained Mr. Stephenson, so there was no decision.—Reporter.]*PSDS 26.1*

This chairman was very generous in allowing liberty of expression to my opponent, but if they say so I will sit down. Perhaps my language is more exceptionable than his.*PSDS 26.2*

(A short pause and Mr. Stephenson proceeded.—Reporter.)*PSDS 26.3*

Now if it was lawful for the priests only to eat the shew-bread, it was not lawful for David; therefore David violated the law. If the Bible, which is the law of our discussion, says the Sabbath was made for man at creation, then I have done that which is not lawful in denying it. But the conclusion of my opponent has no connection with the circumstances under which this language was written.*PSDS 26.4*

David had eaten the shew-bread; the disciples had done that which was not lawful; what is the distinction between them? None. They had both violated the law, but neither had done wrong. The reason

is given why the disciples had not sinned was the fact that the Sabbath's master had set aside the commandment, as the high priest did in the case of David. "The phrase son of man is not in the premise." Cannot I make an application as well as my opponent, if I go according to his logic? I affirm that I have a right to follow him in all his arguments.*PSDS 26.5*

We may reason two ways—from cause to effect, or from effect to cause. Now mark one thing, while no new fact or element may be introduced in different phraseology. I would ask my opponent if the fact of his assumption that the Sabbath was made for man at creation is not a new element inserted into the conclusion? Is there in all this no digression from sound logic?*PSDS 26.6*

You will find in works on logic, that different words are used to indicate the same thing. A fair construction of the passage in Mark shows that the Sabbath was made for the son of man, and I will take the position that Jesus Christ created the heavens and the earth; "therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Can it be possible that my reasoning is out of place, and that his reasoning is not out of place? I do believe that there has been much said in this argument that was entirely irrelevant to the subject under consideration, and I wish the chairman could find some way to confine us to the real issue. I will endeavor to stick to the question if my opponent will.*PSDS 26.7*

Again he says that obligation does not grow out of precept. Where then will he go to get proof of the eternity of principle? But he contradicts himself and annuls his own statements before he gets through. He says "I grant that moral obligation grows out of precept." Moral obligation is just what we were talking about. I wish I could hold him to this admission. The Apostles, Paul and John, both unite in saying that where there is no law, there is no transgression.*PSDS 27.1*

But he says that he can prove by my course of reasoning that it was not wrong to take the name of God in vain before the ten commandments were given at Mount Sinai. I admit it was not before the third was given. We must have a standard of right before we can do wrong. I grant the whole. I will grant it in connection with any

of the ten commandments—the fourth included. If my opponent places New Testament scripture before you in connection with passages from the Old, I will claim the same privilege.*PSDS 27.2*

Deuteronomy 5. ch. 15th v. By quoting this I do not intend to prove that the Sabbath was made for God or man. I have done it to show and prove the specific reason for which the fourth commandment was given. Neither have I ever said it was for that purpose. Nothing is said of the Sabbath of the Lord in this 15th verse. No Sabbath of the Lord is mentioned here.*PSDS 27.3*

"A local reason does not nullify a general one. So says my opponent, at least in substance, but I have shown you that there is a proviso attached to this commandment that limits its observance to the children of Israel. If, in the publication of a reason for the observance of a precept, a limitation is placed upon it, it can never be generalized till that limitation is taken away from it. Now, I ask, could not the Lord declare that He would set apart a day and sanctify it because He had rested on that day after the creation of heaven and earth, and then command the children of Israel to observe that day because they were brought out of Egyptian bondage? My opponent will not admit that a specific reason for observing a precept localizes or limits that precept, and consequently he would ignore the specific reason entirely. The same reason cannot be both general and specific. I aver that the reason why the fourth commandment was given, was because the Lord delivered the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage, and not because of the creation of heaven and earth and the rest of the Lord on the seventh day.*PSDS 27.4*

I call upon my opponent to show a single passage in the holy scriptures, proving that the children of Israel or any nation on the face of the earth, before or since the giving of the ten commandments, were required to observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment because the Lord rested on the seventh day after the creation of heaven and earth. Will he? can he do it?*PSDS 28.1*

Again, he says, I acknowledge that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was not the identical day on which the Lord rested. As well might he acknowledge that this is not the identical day on

which the sun rose and set 2500 years ago. Such acknowledgements have no bearing on this discussion. Two days 2500 years apart cannot be identical. “For the sake of peace on this point, I will here acknowledge that the fourth of July, 1858, was not the identical day in 1776 on which the Declaration of Independence was first promulgated to the civilized world.” I believe in peace on right principles.*PSDS 28.2*

The preposition of is used hero instead of the possessive case. Could there be any Lord’s Sabbath (or Sabbath of the Lord, for they are synonymous expressions,) before there was any Lord? My opponent claims that the Sabbath of the Lord and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment were the same; but if we admit this he will not hold to the true issue. My granting that the Sabbath of the Lord originated when the Sabbath of the fourth commandment originated would not satisfy him, for see where it would lead. The Sabbath of the Lord could not exist before the Lord existed, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not exist before the fourth commandment existed. No Lord, no Lord Sabbath, no fourth commandment, no fourth commandment’s Sabbath. He would either have to admit that the fourth commandment dated back to creation, or else that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment did not date back to the creation, and either one he would deem too much of an admission I presume.*PSDS 28.3*

In the absence of Bible record we can have no idea either of the time when or how the sabbatical institution originated, but, blessed be God, we are not left in the dark valley of conjecture.*PSDS 29.1*

If my opponent admits that the Lord’s Sabbath and the fourth commandment’s Sabbath are the same day, then he must prove that they both originated at the creation. He will have to do this or it will go to the world that he has failed to sustain the affirmative of this proposition. It is the origin of the fourth commandment’s Sabbath that he has undertaken to prove. But he ignores the issue. He denies that the origin of the fourth commandment is synchronous with the obligation to observe it, but again I say, he ignores the issue. We affirm that obligation does not exist before precept. We wish him to reconcile these things. “We want logic.” I apply this remark to his arguments in all its force.*PSDS 29.2*

I am anxious to have my opponent get along to a discussion of the second part of the proposition, but I will try to wait patiently till he gets to it in his own way. He will come to it after a while I have no doubt, and have something to say about, or in regard to the obligation of man to observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment at the present time.*PSDS 29.3*

He brought some passages or one passage to prove that the ten commandments are called a law, but I have not time to notice it. You all know my position on this point, and that I deny that the phrase law is applied to the ten commandments within the two lids of the Bible.*PSDS 29.4*

SEVENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I have, respected friends, to notice some of the points that my opponent and myself have not yet fully settled between us, and I would remark in regard to the logic displayed on *Mark 2nd*, that I cannot see that it is by any means mended.*PSDS 29.5*

The conclusion I before arrived at, I repeat. The Sabbath was made at the creation, and Christ says "The Sabbath was made for man." Now if it was set apart for man, it was for man's use or observance, and if it was made at creation, it was made for man at creation. His position or proposition is this: that if it was made for man, it was made for the son of man. Well, I did not know before now that he claimed an identity between the son of man and the children of Israel, but so it seems, for he has claimed during the whole discussion that the fourth commandment was given especially to the children or Israel, and now he says that commandment or the Sabbath enjoined in it, was made for the son of man. I don't know whether he will go further with his logic and claim that the son of man was delivered from Egyptian bondage or not, but this would follow from his reasoning as a matter of course. But please to note that in arriving at all his conclusions, he don't quote a single scripture.*PSDS 29.6*

"Therefore the son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." This also must mean something. To whom does it refer? Will my opponent say to the son of man? I cannot see that his "logic" would mend the matter in this case either.*PSDS 30.1*

I am very confident that I did not make the statement that "obligation does not grow out of precept," but I do not accuse him of misrepresentation as he has frequently accused me, at least impliedly.*PSDS 30.2*

The commandment was given to enforce the obligation. It is not necessary that the person under the obligation should be aware of the existence of that obligation. But the statement that "obligation does not grow out of precept" needs qualifying. Obligation is not always dependent upon the existence of precept for its existence.

Now I think we shall have him trying to prove that the obligation growing out of the precept contained in the fourth commandment was not promulgated till that commandment was given upon Mount Sinai.*PSDS 30.3*

Leviticus 18:21 v. Here is one of certain specifications God has enjoined. 24th v. From this we see that in all these things the nations were defiled, and they were driven out because they had committed these abominations.*PSDS 30.4*

The promise, as recorded, was given to Abraham and his seed, but still these nations were driven out because they had done these abominations. One of these iniquities was the taking the name of the Lord in vain, as we have seen by v. 21st. Had they any law or commandment from God prohibiting or forbidding this sin? We do not know that they had, and yet they were driven out because they had committed it. Now I ask, does obligation always grow out of precept?—or must there necessarily be precept before there can be obligation?*PSDS 30.5*

Deuteronomy 5 ch. He intimates that I quote this scripture with a different purpose from himself. Well, I claim to have a different purpose, a very different purpose from his. He must not find fault with me for this.*PSDS 31.1*

He may argue that neither of these contain the fourth commandment, but both contain what they call the Sabbath of the Lord It was to prove this and the identity of this Sabbath of the Lord with the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, that I quoted the 14th v. Now, the verse that he quoted does not tell what the Sabbath was, but the verse that I quoted does. “But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,” etc. This passage that we have both quoted, proves something more than the reason why they were commanded to keep the seventh day. It proves that that seventh day or Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the Sabbath of the Lord.*PSDS 31.2*

But my opponent says that God’s resting on the seventh day after the creation of heaven and earth, is not the reason why He commanded its observance as a Sabbath, but it was because He delivered the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. But why

was the seventh day preferred over any other? God preferred that day because it was His rest-day. It was his holy-day, and this holy-day is recognized all through the Bible as the Sabbath of the Lord. *Isaiah 58:13* v. Now the Lord had a holy day, and to avoid the point by saying that holy-day was not the Sabbath of the Lord, would be unworthy any honorable disputant. It is just as much recognized here as the day on which God rested from His work. Every seventh day is the Lord's holy day, and the Lord's holy day is the Lord's rest-day or Sabbath. Every seventh day is a memorial of the creation of heaven and earth. I am not going to notice the proposition of my opponent that the Sabbath of the Lord could not exist before the Lord existed, a great many times. We notice that because he has got another thing appended to it that makes it a little more important. We admit that the Sabbath of the Lord could not exist before the Lord existed, but we do not admit that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not, therefore, exist till the fourth commandment existed. These things are not all necessarily contemporaneous. Now, I ask, could not the Lord of the Sabbath exist before the Sabbath of the Lord existed? But it is the fourth commandment Sabbath, and it could not exist, so says my opponent, before the fourth commandment existed. This we by no means admit. The Lord says, you will remember, "I am the God of Abram, Isaac," etc. Shall we say therefore the God of Abram could not exist till Abram existed?—the God of Isaac could not exist till Isaac existed? Wonderful logic. Now I shall leave this point before an intelligent and discriminating people without further remark.*PSDS 31.3*

The turning point of my destiny seems to rest upon my being able to prove the identity of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment with the Sabbath of the Lord. My dear friend of the negative, do not publish me too soon. I pray you to wait till this discussion is over, at least. I just want to have the people see and judge for themselves whether I deserve to be published or not, before my name is sent out on its literary pilgrimage. Perhaps I may do something to prevent it yet.*PSDS 32.1*

I have already introduced *Leviticus 18* ch., from which it appears that obligation existed without precept. "Where there is no law there is no transgression," and "sin is not imputed when there is no law,"

but we will see if any of these laws were binding before they were given. *Genesis 18:20* v. Now, what is sin? A transgression of the law. But here we find sin before the law was given. I ask my opponent did the law exist before the sin spoken of in this passage existed? But this is not the first account of sin before the law was given. Cain slew his brother Abel before the law was given. *Genesis 6:5* v. Here is wickedness or sin before the law was promulgated. But I shall not stop at the mere declaration of sin and consequent transgression of law before the law was given. I shall add a few quotations bearing directly upon those precepts which were written upon the tables of stone at Mount Sinai. *Genesis 35:2, 3*. Now, here Jacob enjoined it upon his house to put away their strange gods and build an altar to the true God, which plainly proves a violation of the first commandment. Was not this before the first commandment was given?*PSDS 32.2*

Sin existed among the heathen that knew nothing of the law, and that sin was recognized and punished. They had rendered themselves abominable though they knew nothing of the law; from which we see that sin is imputed where there is no law.*PSDS 32.3*

We find that Cain was recognized as a sinner before we have any record of the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," being promulgated on Mount Sinai. *Exodus 1:17*.——did not as the king of Egypt commanded them. They feared God, that is, they feared to sin against God. *Genesis 20:9*, etc. Here we find a transgression of the seventh commandment. *Genesis 39:9*, is also in point. We cannot find the first particle of evidence that these laws or commandments had been promulgated. God only reiterated in these commandments the obligations that had previously existed, for here we find sin recognized and duty recognized that could not be on any other principle. "How can I do this great wickedness," etc. In the 31 ch. 30th and 32nd verses, the eighth commandment precept is recognized. We find the same in the 44 ch. 8th v. "How then should we that are honest never steal?" In the 9th v. we find a pretty severe sentence against them that sinned before the law was known. Now, every person knows that the book of Exodus is recognized as the book of the law, and no record of the promulgation of the law is to be found in Genesis, therefore—[Time up.]*PSDS 33.1*

EIGHTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—My friends, I am here to answer for myself, once more, and I am happy to have the privilege of so doing. I wish to notice first, before I review his arguments of this evening, some positions taken by my opponent in his speech of this afternoon. If my opponent contents himself with responding to me, we shall never get beyond the *5 ch. of Deut*. He appears to be advancing in the wrong direction all the time.*PSDS 33.2*

It seems that I have been misrepresenting him in regard to his statement that there is no obligation without law. But in all his last argument he endeavored to prove that there could be no moral obligation without precept. He has argued my point most successfully and triumphantly.*PSDS 33.3*

Were I sure that he would reach the *5 ch. of Deut.* again, I should think there might be some hopes of an end of the discussion, but at this rate, of progression, backwards, we shall soon be once more at the creation.*PSDS 33.4*

I know that he has taken the position, in his book, that the ten commandments are a perfect law, but according to the ten commandments I can have as many wives as Brigham Young. Is there anything in the ten commandments prohibiting drunkenness? I am not pledged by the observance of the ten commandments to love my neighbor. I merely throw out these ideas to show how imperfect the ten commandments are as a code of morals. I wish to investigate the nature of the ten commandments, and see whether they are a perfect code of morals or not.*PSDS 34.1*

Again, he introduced the covenant or promise to Abraham, but I will wait till he takes a more definite position.*PSDS 34.2*

He assumed that the ten commandments are separately called the law; but in all his quoting scripture he does not reach the point proving his assumption. When he gets there I will attend to him.*PSDS 34.3*

One word more in regard to the conclusion of my opponent, that, from the fact that the Sabbath of the Lord existed from the creation,

therefore, the obligation based on that fact, existed from the creation. I might take the position that from the fact that the month and tenth day of the month has existed from the creation, therefore, the obligation to observe that day as a feast-day, has existed from the creation. Take the fourteenth day of the first month mentioned in *Leviticus 23:5*, also *verse 32nd*, and you will find that the duty to sabbatize did not exist until the commandment enjoining that duty was given.*PSDS 34.4*

Now about the proposition that the God of Abram could not exist till Abram existed, my opponent must know that I would not sacrifice the Bible to grammar. In many cases we are bound to digress from grammatical rules. He says that according to our reasoning God did not exist till Abram existed. Certainly the promulgation of a misapprehension is equivalent to a misrepresentation. I make no insinuations, but I believe a man may just as easily misrepresent as not apprehend. I do not intend to ironize, but merely wish to express my views in as few words as possible. It does not prove that God did not exist till Abram existed. Twice two are four, but twice four are not two. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not exist till the fourth commandment existed. This is a different case altogether. He has twice admitted that there was no obligation without precept, and twice denied it. Once more, did the obligation contained in any of these ten commandments exist previous to precept? I call upon him to show the pre-existence of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, either by implication or by any other means. He certainly has not done it.*PSDS 34.5*

Let us come directly to the point. There is no use in our talking just to fill up our half hour. We wish to expedite the discussion as fast as possible.*PSDS 35.1*

Has my opponent produced a case in which the Lord enforced the precept of the fourth commandment before the fourth commandment existed? You may take the sixth, seventh, eighth and several others, but I will present them all at once, and propose the same question that I have upon the fourth. Did the Lord enforce any of their principles before the commandment existed?*PSDS 35.2*

My opponent says that in the absence of precept there can be no

transgression, and his remark applies on my side of the question, for he thereby teaches that obligation is dependent upon precept. Thus, with my opponent and the Bible to sustain my position, I must gain the point.*PSDS 35.3*

He denies referring to *Deuteronomy 5:4*, except to prove the Sabbath of the Lord. I deny referring to that verse at all. Why should I multiply quotations upon this point? I quoted *Deuteronomy 5:15* v. to show the reason why the fourth commandment was given. He fails to see why the seventh day was set apart. I will state my argument once more. The fault may be with me that I do not state it plain enough for him to see it, and I will try to accommodate my words to his comprehension if possible.*PSDS 35.4*

It is important to see the difference between the reason why a certain day of the week should be selected, and the reason why God enjoined the observance of that day as a Sabbath. On the seventh day God rested from the creation of heaven and earth and all that in them is. It was God's rest-day after finishing his great work. These great events clustered around that day. When great events or the completion of a great work is connected with any day, that day becomes a marked day. It is the case with the fourth of July and many other days that might be mentioned. It is somewhat with nations as it was with God—they render certain, days remarkable by the performance or completion of some great work. Now why did God select the seventh day in preference to any other? Answer. Because he rested on that day. But is this the reason for the observance of that day as a Sabbath by man? I quoted *Deuteronomy 5:15* v. to show the reason why the children of Israel were commanded to observe the Sabbath day, and not to show why that particular day was set apart. "And remember that that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt," etc., "therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Now it seems to me this is as clear as a sun-beam. The reason why the fourth commandment was given, was because the Lord with His Almighty arm brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt. The reason why the Sabbath was fixed upon the seventh day was because on that day rested from the great work of creation. The two reasons must be different. It seems to me that any child could see this. You might as well argue that any two streams of water are

identical as to argue that any two reasons are identical. The commandment was given to a certain people—to the descendants of a certain house, and never can apply to any other people while these two reasons remain upon this holy record. I care not where the tables of stone on which these commandments were written are deposited, or whether they yet exist. I affirm that this fourth commandment was limited to one people, and, in regard to its origin, to one day. My opponent very fairly acknowledged that God did not require them to observe the same identical day on which He rested. Is it possible that the same day could exist 2500 years? But he says the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is only a day answering to that. He admitted this because he must admit it. If one answers to the other, the other will of course answer to the one. But I understand that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment became a Sabbath because God commanded it, and not because He rested on a day answering to that 2500 years before. Why were the children of Israel commanded to keep the feasts of the Lord? Because the Lord feasted? No. Why were all these feast-days called sabbaths of the Lord? Because the Lord rested on those days, or on days answering to them 2500 years before? The idea is absurd. Just so with the fourth of July. The obligation, (if there is any obligation attached to that day,) could not exist before the day was set apart. As far as obligation of any kind is concerned, if there had never been a precept there could be no obligation. There can be none till there is precept. I indorse the sentiment quoted by my opponent that “where there is no law there is no transgression,” and I will try to keep it before this people that “sin is not imputed where there is no law.”*PSDS 35.5*

We are both of us tremendous talkers, (?) but it is my privilege to have the last word, and I will have it as long as my opponent says anything for me to respond to. It is not my duty, according to the rules of debate, to go on and prove anything in advance of his arguments, but to respond to what my opponent says.*PSDS 37.1*

Now he affirms that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation. I wish to ask him when were the feasts of the Lord made? At the creation? No, certainly not; but when they were commanded. Just so with the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.*PSDS 37.2*

Mark 2:27 v. I will give you Matthew if I have time. This is the Divine comment on the Sabbath, therefore we must believe it is correct. We will see whether Jesus Christ is not the man spoken of here. This is an important point. Why were the disciples guiltless? The Illustration given in the context shows that though they had done that which was not lawful, yet they were guiltless. Will you accept the Divine construction of duty in this matter? This is the reason: that the Lord being master of the Sabbath He had a right to grant full license to His disciples to do that which was not lawful on the Sabbath day. [Time up.]*PSDS 37.3*

NINTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—If I was strictly a logician, perhaps I might pursue a different course but whatever progress we may make in this discussion, I feel prompted to call your attention to the fact that my opponent is continually digressing.*PSDS 37.4*

I deny that there is any distinction to be made between the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and the Lord's Sabbath. He has been laboring so long, apparently with no object in view except to fill up his half hour. I wish he would read the fourth commandment once or twice and see if the Sabbath is not there enjoined agreeably to both our ideas. The Lord's Sabbath was made at creation, and until he can show that there is a different Sabbath from the Lord's Sabbath, in the fourth commandment, I shall consider my position safe. The only Sabbath enjoined in the fourth commandment is the Sabbath of the Lord, and that Sabbath was made at creation. Now, grant his reasoning, (that the only reason why the children of Israel were commanded to observe the seventh day was because they had been brought out of the land of Egypt,) and that was the Sabbath upon which the Lord rested after making the heavens and the earth. I believe the congregation sees that this talk of my opponent about the "two reasons" has no bearing upon the question. The Sabbath of creation which was the Lord's Sabbath, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment are the same; and nobody of thoughtful mind who has listened attentively to this discussion thus far, can fail to see that a large share of what my opponent has said, has been a mere play upon words. Let him continue this course if he chooses, he is welcome to all the advantage he gains by it.*PSDS 37.5*

I do not know that I need to refer to it, but I will remark that I hardly know how we can prove Brigham Young guilty of violating the ten commandments in having a number of wives. My opponent says, further, that drunkenness can be indulged without violating the law of the ten commandments. Now why does he claim the absolute sense of the ten commandments? Dare he say that this is inferrable from a fair construction of the word of God? I think not.*PSDS 38.1*

The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the Lord's Sabbath,

and that day did exist from the creation. Could not the God of Abram exist before Abram existed? Could not the Sabbath of the fourth commandment exist before the commandment was proclaimed? It is clear that there is no difficulty whatever in the case. I declare it is tedious to notice such equivocations so often.*PSDS 38.2*

My opponent says he read the 15th verse: I read the 14th. It was the Divine precept that I read, and it was to show that the Sabbath of the fourth Commandment was the Sabbath of the Lord and therefore existed from the creation.*PSDS 38.3*

It seems that all my scripture references to show that sin existed and was punished before the law was promulgated, are of little consequence to my opponent. But other circumstances may impart a knowledge of right and wrong as surely as a proclamation of the law itself. That obligation to observe the principles contained in the precepts of the ten commandments existed before they were proclaimed from Mount Sinai is clearly proved, by implication, as the existence of the law itself at any subsequent period.*PSDS 38.4*

A general reason could not be general and yet be local, but a general and local reason could both exist together. Every one must admit this.*PSDS 39.1*

I am very anxious to progress, but not faster than we can and get the light before the people.*PSDS 39.2*

It is true that the Sabbath enjoined in the fourth commandment was not the identical twenty-four hours on which the Lord rested after the creation. The Lord did not enjoin it as that day, but as a day answerable to that. But you could not get the idea that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and the Lord's Sabbath or Sabbath of creation are the same, more clearly if the Bible had said that the Lord did really rest upon every seventh day of the week. "The seventh day is the Sabbath (or rest-day) of the Lord, and in it thou shalt not do any work." Are we not satisfied to take the Lord's own word in this matter? I am willing to do it, and also to rest this point with this people.*PSDS 39.3*

Matthew 12 ch. (to which I suppose my opponent made reference,

though he did not cite the passage,) is the same as *Mark 2* ch., only it does not go so far. It is by no means an explanation in the sense Elder Stephenson would wish you to understand it, and I am willing that it should rest as it is before this people.*PSDS 39.4*

We have not only separate commands, but we have a declaration that God had a covenant which He called a law before the giving of the ten commandments at Mount Sinai. I will quote *Deuteronomy 4:12, 13*, to show that God's law was the ten commandments, and also that His law existed and was obligatory anterior to the bringing of the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt. *1 Chronicles 16:15, 18*, quote the whole—"to Israel for an everlasting covenant." Here you have got both the law and the promise.*PSDS 39.5*

Genesis 26:5 v. Here we have a recognition of a promise, commandments, and laws before the ten were given upon Mount Sinai. *1 Chronicles 16:15, 16, 17* verses. From this we see that a promise is a covenant, and that a commandment is a covenant. The Lord wrote the ten commandments upon two tables of stone, but here we find that they existed before they were confirmed to the people at Mount Sinai. We have something at stake in this. God's law not only existed at the beginning of the Jewish dispensation, but originated beyond it.*PSDS 39.6*

In reference to the Sabbath, which we have shown existed at the creation, we wish to see if we cannot find it in the New Testament dispensation. We shall claim an acknowledgment of it in the New Testament record in the same terms as in the Old Testament, without the abrogation of a single condition for its observance. The Sabbath was placed upon the seventh day because the Lord rested upon that day, before the Jewish nation existed, and before any nation existed, or any part of the human race. And now when we have seen this, we find that when the Lord brought His people out of the land of Egypt he established a basis for the promulgation of the ten commandments as we find them written upon the tables of stone. We must consider that the sanctity continues after that, as we see no reason for supposing that it has ceased. Do the scriptures teach that there was any sanctity placed upon the seventh day when the people were brought out of the land of Egypt that did not exist before? We have not seen that they do. But they

do teach as we have shown, that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment existed from the creation.*PSDS 40.1*

Well, we will now proceed to identify the Sabbath of the fourth commandment with the Sabbath of the New Testament, by reference to *Luke 22, 24* chs., commencing at the *54th v.* of the former. I will read the *1st v.* of the 24th ch. also. The fourth commandment has reference to the Lord's Sabbath, and here we find both the Sabbath and the commandment mentioned in the same connection; hence we would ask if the two Sabbath are not the same, even though one was observed after the crucifixion? They are both the Sabbath of the Lord and both the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.*PSDS 40.2*

I would call your attention to the fact that this is the testimony of Luke the evangelist. Some of our friends will perhaps say that nothing applies to us till we get to the book of Acts. But this record was made for those living under the new dispensation, and it must have been written for their instruction. What is here stated is for us. Now the question is, did Luke mean what he wrote? We think no one will deny that he did. Luke recognized the Sabbath and the commandment enjoining the Sabbath, and we claim that the Sabbath so recognized is none other than this one of the fourth commandment. We also have the testimony of the Apostle Daniel to the same effect. [No passage noted in my M. S.—Reporter]—— 15th ch. [Book not noted—Reporter.] James is giving his opinion at a conference in Jerusalem. They had been preaching but they were now at the place where they were empowered to preach, and they were the first who were thus empowered, so it is presumed they would understand all about the Sabbath and the commandments. [Reads the passage above referred to—Reporter.] Thus we see another inspired apostle recognizing the Sabbath in the same way without ever once claiming that the sanctity had ceased or in any sense departed from it.*PSDS 40.3*

TENTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—The question is not, do the New Testament writers recognize the Sabbath, but has the precept to observe the Sabbath been perpetuated through the present age? When my opponent can prove this, his argument is to be admitted as sustaining the affirmative of the question before us. But to prove that the New Testament writers recognize the Sabbath of the fourth Commandment, and to prove that they enjoin in observance, are two very distinct and different things as any [original illegible] readily [original illegible]. Let my [original illegible] bring one single text, from the pages of the New Testament enforcing the precept of the fourth commandment, and I will waive all farther controversy. He must do this or his arguments will not be pertinent to the question. Suppose my opponent should or could bring texts from the New Testament showing that circumcision was there recognized, would it prove thru a precept enjoining a practice of that rite has been enforced upon the present age? Would this be relevant to the question before us? Or suppose he should find the Apostles speaking of feasts just as the prophets spoke of them; would this be relevant? I speak in all sincerity when I say I believe it would be just as relevant as the remarks of my opponent for the last fifteen minutes before he sat down.*PSDS 41.1*

The Apostles observed all the Jewish feasts, but this fact is by no means relevant to our discussion, and it does not follow that I am bound to consider their observance binding upon the present age.*PSDS 42.1*

The chairman, at my request, has read the question, and I am sorry it was not read before my opponent commenced his last speech, as it might have saved all this rambling talk. I beg to remind my opponent that I am bound to follow him as long as he sticks to the issue, but no longer.*PSDS 42.2*

I will take the position that the word of is always possessive where it is preceded and succeeded by a noun, and I will give him from now till 10 o'clock to show from any book or author whatever, that it is not so. The house of Mr. Newton—Mr. Newton's house—the God of Abram—Abram's God, etc.*PSDS 42.3*

He admits that the reason why the seventh day was selected for a Sabbath, was because the Lord rested on that day, and every person must see the difference between the Lord's Sabbath and the observance of the same enforced by precept.*PSDS 42.4*

Now, will he deny that David was a man of God? and yet David was a polygamist. Let him quote one of the ten commandments prohibiting fornication or a plurality of wives, and I will grant he has done something towards showing that they are perfect law—a complete moral code. How shall we convict a man of sin for doing any of these things, or for drunkenness, under the ten commandments? Ah! there is the difficulty. My opponent could not even reprove the "father of the faithful." But come down to the New Testament and we find Christ and Apostles interdicting all these sins. "And they too shall be one flesh." Nothing of the kind in the ten commandments. Take the New Testament and you can prove a man guilty of adultery if he but "look on a woman to lust after her," but upon the hypothesis that the ten commandments are a perfect moral code, my mind may be filled with adultery, and according to the seventh commandment even you could not touch me for it Where is the perfection in a law that does not expressly prohibit drunkeness? Let my opponent come up boldly and meet these points. I can show that a man may keep all the ten commandments and still be morally guilty before God and man, of the grossest sins. Suppose a man should keep liquor in his house, and not only habitually get drunk himself, but entice others to do the same, I ask my opponent how that man could be convicted of sin by the ten commandments? But especially how could a man be convicted of adultery or fornication by this "perfect law"—this "complete moral code?" It is not at all strange how a man may be convicted by other commandments than those written upon tables of stone, but can he by those? Again, I say, let my opponent come up boldly and meet these points. They are all important.*PSDS 42.5*

Furthermore, let him in his future arguments answer this question: Was the Sabbath of the fourth commandment enjoined or commanded to be observed by the New Testament writers? I wish to have this question written down, for it is the substance of the real issue between us, and it seems to be so simple I am ashamed to repeat it so many times.*PSDS 43.1*

Now, although God could exist, and did exist, anterior to Abram, who will argue from this that he existed as Abram's God? Just so with the sabbath of the fourth commandment: although the seventh day had existed from the creation, who will argue that therefore the obligation to observe it as a sabbath originated at the creation? The existence of a certain day does not prove the origin of an obligation to observe that day. My opponent takes the position that because the sabbath of the Lord existed or was made at creation, therefore the ten commandments existed anterior to the time of Abram; but he must prove this, or, by all sound principles of biblical exposition, his statements are worthless. He has tried to show the existence of their principles, by implication; but we want plain, unequivocal Bible testimony. Implication will never answer in reference to a doctrine which, if true, should be inwrought with almost every page of the Bible. For one, I will not advocate any doctrine that is not built upon the plain words of the Bible. If my opponent wishes me to believe and advocate his theory, let him bring one plain "thus saith the lord" in its support, and I am with him; but argument based on implication will never convince me.*PSDS 43.2*

I availed myself of his admission that where there is no precept there is no obligation; but I have nothing to do with argument founded on implication. Let him come forward and prove that the sabbath of the fourth commandment was promulgated and enjoined at creation. Let him prove that it existed anterior to Abram, and it will be just what we wish.*PSDS 43.3*

Can the seventh day of the fourth commandment be the day on which the Lord rested at the creation? I am ashamed to have to ask so many questions.*PSDS 44.1*

"Not the same twenty-four hours that God rested." Mark this. Now, if it is not the same twenty-four hours, it is simply a day answering to the day on which God rested.*PSDS 44.2*

The question is not the sanctification of the day on which God rested, but the sanctification of the sabbath of the fourth commandment; and my opponent fails to meet the issue. He argued, in effect, that a covenant and promise are the same as commandments, and endeavored to prove from this promise that

Abram had the ten commandments. My friend claims to have more regard for the words of the Bible than for logic; but I fear he has sadly perverted both. He reads *Genesis 26th* chapter; but I am not under obligations to answer it. In the 105th Psalm, *verses 8-11*, and *1 Chronicles 16:15-18*, compared with *Genesis 26:1-5*, is his entire proof that Abraham had the ten commandments. But since God tells us in so many words that the convent commanded to a thousand generations was, all that remains to be done, in order to set the matter in clear light before you, will be to read the language of God. “Be ye mindful of His covenant, the word which He commanded to a thousand generations, even of the covenant which He made with Abraham, and of His oath unto Isaac, and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and unto Jacob for an everlasting covenant saying. Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance.”*PSDS 44.3*

Here the Lord tells us what word, what covenant, what law. He commanded, “saying, Unto thee will” (have I given the ten commandments” No) “I give the land of Canaan.” Compare the foregoing covenant, promise, law, with the original *Genesis 15:18*: “In the same day, the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given the land,” etc. Hence, my opponent is placing his own arguments against the plain words of the Bible and of God! The Bible is to be the only evidence in this discussion, according to our rules, and I shall call for the reading of them if there is much more digression. What right has my opponent to put words in the mouth of God which He has never spoken? Where will you find anything more than a promise to give him the land? *Genesis 15th* chapter, *18th verse*. Here we find the covenant and here we find the promise, and here we find that this passage and the 105th Psalm harmonize exactly.*PSDS 44.4*

He reiterates that the ten commandments existed anterior to the days of Abram. He claims that it way the same covenant at Sinai, and I am glad he has taken this position. My opponent anticipated me here. He thought I would take this possible and I am not afraid of the consequences. The Bible will sustain itself, and if I cannot sustain, my position, it will not be for want of Bible truth.*PSDS 45.1*

Deuteronomy 4th chapter, *12th and 13th verses*. Mark this: If nine

commandments, or their principles existed, still the ten did not, and, until my opponent proves the existence of the whole number, he cannot find a place for the fourth. He is only a poor, mortal man, like the rest of us, and his statements, unsupported by Bible testimony, are of no value whatever.*PSDS 45.2*

Deuteronomy 5:1 v., to the 3rd inclusive, shows when and for whom this covenant was made. The same is found in *Exodus 34:27, 28* verses:*PSDS 45.3*

And the Lord said unto Moses. Write thou these words for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel.*PSDS 45.4*

And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink Water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.*PSDS 45.5*

Why do our friends present these ten commandments in such large letter upon their card here before you and leave out this important preface which is placed before them in the Bible? Is it to dupe the people? I will not say that it is. I suppose they think it would look too Israelitish for the present day, and I think the same myself. I would like to have them write all the words of God as they were spoken by His voice from the blazing mount of Sinai, and not be content to write only a part. I would like to see whether they would not then give the reason why the fourth commandment (as well as all the rest) was enjoined. You could then read there, upon their card, in large capitals, “because you were bondmen in the land of Egypt.”*PSDS 45.6*

The fifth commandment contains an Israelitish promise; [5th commandment here read.—Reporter.] Now, does God here refer to the Gentiles? Has that promise been changed? It is now, and always was, confined to a prolongation of the present life in the land they were going over to possess. Paul promises long life in the earth for obedience to this precept. *Ephesians 6:3*. There is a wide and marked difference as any one can see.*PSDS 45.7*

I was in hopes that my remark—[Time up.]
Close of first day’s discussion—six hours and ten speeches.*PSDS*

46.1

ELEVENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I remark first in regard to the question of order. You will see that I have treated the Mosaic dispensation as but one part or branch of God's plan of government. I regard the purposes of God as a unit, and I claim that God's commands never conflict with each other. I have taken several of the precepts of the ten commandments, and have shown that they existed before their promulgation from Mount Sinai. I intend henceforth to pursue another course and show the perpetuity of that law. I called your attention to the fact that several of the New Testament writers have recognized the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and, so far as we know, there has been no abrogation of that or any other of the ten commandment precepts. It is my privilege to show that there has been no abrogation of that law, as well as other things relevant to our discussion. My opponent intimates that unless I lead out faster, he will go on and prove the negative. He may do so when I give him the privilege, but not before. One thing should be taken into account, our temperaments are widely different; and therefore, he may be displeased with my mode of pursuing an argument; or I may be displeased with his. But let me say, once for all, that I have led in this discussion just as fast as I intended to lead. I wish to get the truth fairly before the people, so that they could judge for themselves.*PSDS 46.2*

I will acknowledge that I have no very extensive or remarkable knowledge of logic, and I must say that I have never had an opportunity to take lessons except in this tent and during this discussion, in such logic as has here been presented by my opponent. He has acknowledged, virtually at least, that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation, for the only Sabbath mentioned in the fourth commandment is the Sabbath of the Lord. There is certainly but one Sabbath mentioned in the fourth commandment. Either the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at the creation, or the Sabbath of the Lord was not made at the creation, for they are the same. And yet, according to my friend of the negative, the Sabbath of the Lord existed at the creation, and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment did not; that is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is not identical with itself. I confess that I cannot see why he makes this "distinction without a difference," I

confess, freely, and before all these intelligent people, that I do not understand such “logic.” I do not wonder that my friend desired that I should lead off into another field, for, if I were in his place, I should wish the same. I should wish to leave this part of the subject and my own “logic” as soon as possible.*PSDS 46.3*

1 Chronicles 16:16 v. Is it “logic” to affirm that this covenant was a promise? Can the people keep or break the promise of God? We hear that they sometimes break the law, but never the promise. Why should the two terms be brought together? The promise and the law. It would take considerable of my friend’s “logic” to convince me that they are the same.*PSDS 47.1*

Now, the commanding of the covenant “to a thousand generations” we would like to have kept in sight, as we may refer to it again.*PSDS 47.2*

My opponent remarked in one of his speeches that I made a tremendous bound over the Old Testament into the New, but I must take the course I think best, whether it is what he would term leading out or not.*PSDS 47.3*

Jeremiah 6:19. The law written on the two tables of stone is the one here spoken of, and it was rejected.*PSDS 47.4*

17 ch. *20th, 21st, 22nd verses*, also. I want to know if they were not to hallow this Sabbath day according to the law God had given them at Mount Sinai. But some will say this was according to the ceremonial law instead of the moral law. You may take all the ceremonies of the Mosaic dispensation, and you will find they are all instituted in consequence of a violation of the law of the ten commandments. “Sin is the transgression of the law,” and if they had not transgressed the law, there would never have been any ceremonies instituted. Again, the Lord spoke the ten commandments with his own voice. He declared the covenant and commanded them to keep it. We wish to claim a distinction between the covenant made and the covenant commanded. *Jeremiah 7:22, 23*. They were the condition of the covenant—“that it may be well unto you.” Now we only claim a distinction which God himself has made. We wish to call attention to the 89th Psalm. Here David is speaking by prophesy. 27th v. He has made a covenant with David

according to the first part of this chapter. "——and their iniquity with stripes." There is a condition laid down here which is keeping of the commandments of the Lord. *Jeremiah 9*. We want to ascertain the law upon which His promises are based. The chapter commences with a most bitter lamentation. It is a very peculiar chapter. *22nd verse*, etc. The obedience required of the children of Israel is that they forsake, not the Lord's law which He set before them. They are required to obey his voice, that is, the law spoken by His voice at Mount Sinai. My opponent claims that God gave this law only to His special people—the children of Israel—but could not the other nations—the Gentiles—be made partakers of its benefits? Look at the New Testament on this point. *Matthew 23*. Here is a parable commencing at the 33rd verse, but I will not take the time to read it all. "——therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you," etc. The condition was their disobedience to the voice of God, and therefore He would give the kingdom to those who would obey his voice, or keep his commandments.*PSDS 47.5*

[I find nothing about the "voice" or "commandments," either, in the parable referred to, but have given a true copy of my phonographic report, here, as elsewhere. Perhaps Mr. W. may have found something about "voice" or "commandments" in the marginal references, but if so, he did not allude to them so as to enable me to note it.—Reporter.]*PSDS 48.1*

John has declared that this is the love of God that they keep His commandments. But this is more clearly brought to view in the 5th ch. *17th and 18th verses* of Matthew. "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill," etc. Now the only chance of avoiding the conclusion that Christ did not do away with the law of the ten commandments, is to claim that the word fulfilled means the ending; but I shall not meet this position till it is advanced. "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments," etc. Now, if the word fulfill means the ending in the 17th verse, fulfilled must mean ended in the 18th.——Then this cannot refer to the law which was declared to be abolished——distinct from the law given on Mount Sinai.—— What is the conclusion of the whole matter? That He is not going to abolish the ceremonial law till heaven and earth pass? No: because it was the condition of the covenant that He came to preach.——or, as Campbell renders it, "shall be of no esteem," if I remember right.

——*PSDS 48.2*

[This is badly “mixed” here, but I can’t help it.—Rep.]*PSDS 49.1*

And then Christ goes on farther, and, if I can judge correctly, directly across the track of my opponent’s remarks last evening. He has given us the same that the prophets had.——What is adultery? 27th v. It is a transgression of the seventh commandment, and Jesus has not here introduced a new law. Does He say that a man’s mind may be filled with adultery, etc., (as my opponent did last evening,) and yet not transgress the commandments? Has He gone one side of the seventh commandment? My opponent says he can have as many wives as Brigham Young, and still keep all the ten commandments. Our Savior has quoted the seventh commandment, word for word, from the decalogue——. That is the Savior’s statement.——I might go on to other declarations to show that hatred is a violation of the sixth commandment.—If a man kills his brother by accident, his is no murder; but if he hates him, he is. It must include sinful feelings as well as actions. About drunkenness: Permit me, my friends, to take the scripture in this case. Is not drunkenness the gratification of a depraved appetite? Is not the drunkard one of those mentioned by the Apostle, who “make a God of their belly?” Do you believe that this is literal, or figurative? I consider that drunkenness is a species of idolatry, and therefore that it is a plain violation of the first commandment.*PSDS 49.2*

Now, what about the fifth commandment? My opponent says it is a different one in the New Testament. What does Paul say in Ephe. 6, 1, 3? Now, it is claimed that this is not the same promise, because that is the land, and this is the world, or the earth. Very well, we will see—[Time up.]*PSDS 49.3*

TWELFTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—In the first place, my opponent explains his position. He has admitted, in a former speech, that all obligation grows out of precept—"where there is no law, there is no transgression"—and this is virtually admitting the truth of the negative of our question.*PSDS 50.1*

I never, endorsed his position in reference to the principle of the seventh commandment, except as a hypothesis on which to base an argument. I merely endorsed his position to show that it was the same he had taken on another point, and had subsequently denied. The question whether or not I really endorse or assume his position is another question entirely.*PSDS 50.2*

Now, about leading and following: It is my duty to follow him, I admit; but, if he fails to lead out on the question at issue, I have the right, according to every parliamentary usage, to go on and prove the negative. My friend should qualify his statements about giving me the privilege, etc. This is a question of order. All turns on the point whether he leads according to the principles of parliamentary law or not. If he does, I am bound to follow, but not otherwise.*PSDS 50.3*

I quoted his position in regard to the pre-existence of the ten commandments, to answer his position on other points. It is his duty, not to prove the pre-existence of the fourth commandment or any other, but to prove the pre-existence of the precept of the fourth commandment. It is the duty of the affirmative to adhere strictly to the proposition before us. His argument about the pre-existence of the principles of the ten commandments was not to the question at all. If he does not adhere to the strict letter of the question, he should at least to the implied meaning; and I affirm that there is nothing in it, either expressed or implied, about the principles of the ten commandments. For aught we know, the principles of some of them are eternal; but that does not prove that the precept of the fourth, or any other, are eternal.*PSDS 50.4*

He claims that to prove that the sabbath of the Lord was made at creation proves that the sabbath of the fourth commandment was

made likewise at creation; “for,” says he, “they are identical.” “There is but one sabbath mentioned in the fourth commandment, and that is the sabbath of the Lord.” I have but one remark to make in regard to this: He has twice taken the position that the sabbath of the fourth commandment was the identical day on which God rested, and twice that it was a day answering to that. My opponent will not claim that God has rested every seventh day since the creation; but this must be true if the sabbath of the Lord and the sabbath of the fourth commandment are identical, for the Lord certainly rested on the Lord’s sabbath. Now, the question is, when did the Lord command the observance of the sabbath of the fourth commandment? My opponent has been digressing by leaving the words “fourth commandment” out of the discussion entirely, and substituting in their place “the Lord’s sabbath.” The question is not upon the sabbath of the Lord or the day upon which the Lord rested, but upon the sabbath of the fourth commandment. When was it enforced upon the people of God? I deny that the Lord’s sabbath and the sabbath of the fourth commandment are the same. Even though the Lord’s sabbath continued every seventh day from the creation to the time of the giving of the ten commandments at Mount Sinai, it would not be inferable from that, that the sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation. I call upon my opponent to show that the observance of the fourth commandment sabbath was binding upon man before the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage. It is very easy to overlook the real question at issue. I think our positions have been stated to the people often enough to have them perfectly understood. If we can never make our views known upon this point, why not leave it?*PSDS 50.5*

But another criticism which I made, he did not notice. I refer to the difference I showed to exist between the reason why a certain day was selected and the reason why the commandment to observe that day was given. The only reason why the Lord commanded them to observe the sabbath at all was because they were delivered from Egyptian bondage. To give a reason why a certain day was selected, and to give a reason why a commandment was given, are two different things.*PSDS 51.1*

One of the rules by which we agreed to be guided in this discussion

was that the Bible should be our only authority. I will read the Bible again, and remember that our conclusion must be based upon the most obvious construction of the language used. Now, turn with me and let me read just what God tells us. He said: *1 Chronicles 16:15*. Now, what did God say here? His word is to be perpetuated to a thousand generations, etc. Now, turn to the 105th Psalm and then to the covenant with Abraham. See if the Bible will not harmonize with itself. "Saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan."*PSDS 51.2*

I was indirectly accused, last evening, of using too many words; therefore, I will let the Bible speak for itself. *Genesis 15:18*. "Unto thy seed have I given this land."*PSDS 52.1*

While dwelling on the land promised to the seed of Abraham, let me answer an argument my opponent advanced last evening, based upon some passages in the New Testament. Compare *Deuteronomy 5:16* with *Ephesians 6:2, 3*, and I will show you wherein my opponent erred. Here we see that while one promise was confined to the land of Canaan, the other promise embraced the world. Look here upon this card: suppose we substitute the word "earth" for "land," here. "Honor thy father, etc., that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Would this promise embrace the earth? Don't you see that the two words earth and land are not alike—that one cannot be used or substituted for the other? My opponent's criticism falls under its own weight.*PSDS 52.2*

Jeremiah 16:19. [I am not sure that this reference is right, but I copy as usual.—Reporter.] Here he gives a reason why this can not be considered a moral law. My opponent takes the position that ceremonies and sacrifices grew out of a violation of the moral law. What does he mean by the moral law? The ten commandments, I suppose. Is the question granted that the ten commandments are a moral law at all? By no means. I denied that the word law was applied to the ten commandments between the two lids of the Bible. But mark how my opponent moves in his efforts to prove that the ten commandments are a moral law. He could not do it by the (so called) law itself. He could not do it by the2 Old Testament. After all, he must go to the New Testament. He refers back to the origin of

the institution of marriage, recorded in Genesis; but will he take the position that Moses and Abraham violated the moral law by having a plurality of wives? More of this anon.*PSDS 52.3*

Will my opponent undertake to show that the precept which requires us to love our neighbors as ourselves was written upon the tables of stone? [Several New Testament commandments were here cited.—Reporter.] No. They were all written in the book, and never anywhere else. He can prove that the ceremonial law has been abolished, but an affirmation is worthless if unsupported by argument. It is not the duty of a man to go and found arguments upon what he will do or what he will prove. Let him give us plain Bible testimony showing the existence of two laws—a ceremonial law and a moral law. He remarked that he believed God's purposes were a unit, and we believe in the unity of the law by which God's people were governed. *1 Kings 2:3*—"And keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, to keep His statutes, and His commandments, and His judgments, and His testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself." I will show you that an unit law is spoken of in every text. You will hear the word testimony introduced by and by, to show that these terms are peculiar to the ten commandments; but I will show you that all the commandments of God were called the voice of God. The terms, law of God and law of Moses are used interchangeably all through the Bible.*PSDS 52.4*

"To offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord upon the altar of the burnt-offering continually, morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord, which he commanded Israel." *1 Chronicles 16:40*.*PSDS 53.1*

"And Hezekiah appointed the courses of the priests and the Levites after their courses, every man according to his service, the priests and Levites for burnt-offerings and for peace-offerings, to minister. and to give thanks, and to praise in the gates of the tents of the Lord. He appointed also the king's portion of his substance for the burnt-offerings, to wit, for the morning and evening burnt-offerings, and the burnt-offerings for the sabbaths, and for the new moons and for the set feasts, as it is written in the law of the Lord.

Moreover, he commanded the people that dwelt in Jerusalem to give the portion of the priests and the Levites, that they might be encouraged in the law of the Lord." *2 Chronicles 31:2-4*.*PSDS 53.2*

Here it is the law of God because the Lord commanded it.*PSDS 53.3*

"Then stood up Jeshua the son of Jozadak, and his brethren the priests. and Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, and his brethren, and builded the altar of the God of Israel, to offer burnt-offerings thereon, as it is written in the law of Moses the man of God," *Ezra 3:2*.*PSDS 53.4*

"Now the rest of the acts of Josiah, and his goodness, according to that which was written in the law of the Lord." *2 Chronicles 35:26*.*PSDS 53.5*

The book of the law of Moses was the law commanded by God. The book of the law and the law of Moses are used interchangeably.*PSDS 54.1*

"And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water-gate, and they spake unto Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses, which the Lord had commanded to Israel. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street that was before the water-gate from the morning until mid-day, before the men and the women. and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the law." "And they found written in the law which the Lord had commanded by Moses, that the children of Israel should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month." "Also day by day, from the first day unto the last day, he read in the book of the law of God. And they kept the feast seven days, and on the eighth day was a solemn assembly, according unto the manner." *Nehemiah 8:1-3, 14, 18*.*PSDS 54.2*

"And they stood up in their place, and read in the book of the law of the Lord their God one fourth part of the day; and another fourth part they confessed and worshipped the Lord their God." "Thou

camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them Thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes and laws, by the hand of Moses Thy servant." *Ibid, 9:3, 13, 14*.*PSDS 54.3*

The same law is called the law of God and the law of Moses. The terms are used interchangeably.*PSDS 54.4*

"And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished. they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord, (as it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord,) and to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons." *Luke 2:22-24*.*PSDS 54.5*

I might go on and read more on this point, but you see that these terms are used in regard to the same great unit system of God's government. Will my opponent be so good as to prove the two law theory before he bases his conclusions upon it?*PSDS 54.6*

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." *Matthew 5:17*.*PSDS 54.7*

I shall not have time to call your attention to all the passages I have marked. The phrase "law and the prophets" are used to denote *all* the law and *all* the prophets. As well might a man argue that all the prophets means only *ten* of the prophets, as that the *law* means only ten of the hundreds of commandments contained in the great law system.*PSDS 54.8*

THIRTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I am growing quite fond of "logic." I quoted Scripture to show a distinction; but it appears that my friend has got where he cannot see the distinction. It will not answer for me to go back and notice points several times over, merely because my opponent brings them up; but I will here remark, that I claim *Exodus 20*. as the chapter from which to take the law of the ten commandments. My friend of the negative will claim *Deuteronomy 5*. They are nearly the same, but still there is a difference. Compare *Exodus 20:12*, with *Deuteronomy 5:16*. My opponent quoted the latter—"*in the land ye go over to possess*," but I do not find it so; therefore, his comparison with *Ephesians 6*., loses its force. There are but three positions to be taken with reference to *Ephesians 6*. It must be the first commandment absolutely, or it must be—*PSDS 55.1*

[Through some strange inadvertence or accident, I did not get the rest of the above sentence.—Reporter.]*PSDS 55.2*

Now it is not the first commandment; and if Abraham had a commandment to go up out of the land, we do not know it. Our Savior has quoted the commandment, but without attaching any promise. If my opponent could only leave out that word "first," his criticism would be worth something. It is not the first commandment with Christ——When the Apostles had stated the effect of the Gospel after——What was the commandment they gave?——They taught that the promise is to you and your children. Where is it, then, that it is the first commandment with promise? It is in the decalogue. There it is, and you will find it in no other relation except in that code of laws. This is one of the strongest positions proving the perpetuity of the law of the ten commandments as given at Mount Sinai.*PSDS 55.3*

But about the two promises, (to Abraham). Could not God bless all the families of the earth——I do not see that my opponent helps the case at all. I shall now proceed with the investigation as I commenced. I shall proceed upon the Scripture as near as practicable. *Matthew 5*. Our Savior here enforces, in every case, the moral principles of these ten commandments, and shows their

perpetuity. Some claim that because He used different words, therefore, there are two different laws; but the whole law here enforced, rests on existing obligations, as we see by *verses 17, 18, 19*. Here is acknowledged the origin of these moral obligations, *Matthew 7:21*. In the version of——it is "ye that work lawlessness." Have we got a license for a deal of iniquity here in the ten commandments? Look at the second. Now, that the principle of love is not recognized in the ten commandments, I would like to have my opponent say, after carefully reading them; not before. But my opponent says we have got some left off our card—an important "preface!" I do not think we shall ever get up a card with his preface attached. What is really intended? My opponent says this is a law for the Israelites. Now, my friends, if you have got any different God in the Scriptures, I will put your preface upon the very next card I get up.*PSDS 55.4*

Isaiah 30:8, 9. I wanted to see what class of people are here described—"children that will not hear the law of the Lord." Now if there is no better passage than my friend's preface, I will put it on the very next card I get up. [According to my friend's position,] we have got the declaration that faith in Christ will not ensure us an entrance into the kingdom of heaven. The fifth commandment we have already noticed. I shall proceed to quote the Apostle Paul. He argues on justification by faith—*Romans 2:9*, etc.—that there is "no respect of persons with God." And then we have the two classes introduced—both Jew and Gentile. We have this classification carried still further in the 12th verse. And then here are three verses in parentheses. "The doers of the law shall be justified. The work of the law written in their hearts," etc. He has further declared they shall be judged "by Jesus Christ." *16th verse*. Then the declaration is made according to the rule of the Gospel. The law and the Gospel run together. *17th verse*.—the law of faith? the law of Christ? No. It is one thing to know the law, and another thing to do it. They were those who rested in the law that they did not do. If you want to know the law of God, here it is in *verse 21*; here is the sixth commandment in *verse 22*; here is the seventh and also the second —*verse 24*; here is the third, etc., etc. Still farther on, there is a plain and marked distinction between circumcision and the law. The same is continued in the next chapter. Here is the plainest distinction that can be made. "What advantage, then, hath the

Jew?" etc. "Much every way: chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." They knew God's law, and this certainly was a very great advantage. Well, now, beloved friends, these oracles of God must be the rule of the judgment of God. And they are not made void because of justification by faith—("I speak as a man")—something necessary in order that the judgments of God should be approved. All unrighteousness is sin, isn't it? Where is righteousness revealed? If our transgression of the law cancelled the, what then? What is the truth? My Opponent would certainly be on this principle—that our transgression of these principles would not undo our righteousness. "Let us do evil that good may come?" etc. Both Jews and Gentiles are under sin, therefore all are sinners. "There is none righteous, no, not one." It is singular that this very scripture should prove both Jews and Gentiles sinners. We have the Savior frequently reasoning out of the Scriptures. There were no Gentile Scriptures, and we get no scripture except what we get through the Jews. Here Paul refers to this law in the 19th verse. The law and the gospel work together. The law proves a man a sinner, and the gospel shows the way of justification and redemption. Now, we understand that we are not justified by the law, at all, after we have transgressed it, but by faith in Jesus Christ. Even all have sinned, and Christ suffered for the remission of sin. Have we not shown that unbelief made these oracles of none effect, therefore God would not be just in judging—[Time up.]*PSDS 56.1*

FOURTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—The first position of my opponent was in regard to my quotation of *Deuteronomy 5:16*. I may have quoted it wrong, for when the affirmative quotes a great many passages or texts, it is impossible to keep up, and I sometimes cite from memory without reference to the Bible directly. I must commend him for his dispatch. Now I will read it just as it is. [Reads.] The only point is, the land thou goest over to possess. If I repeated it so, I acknowledge an error in words, but the idea is the same. This promise, then, does not offer life in the earth or in the wilderness, but in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee. Now, the great mass of the people would not receive the land promised to Abraham, at all, because they lived and died wicked, while they were on their way to Canaan. Now, a prolongation of the present life was in that promise, therefore, my criticism here stands good.*PSDS 57.1*

He also reached another criticism of mine on *Ephesians 6*. He concludes my criticism would not be good because it is not the first commandment in the Bible. I cannot see why, if it is the commandment in the list of commandments with promise. Paul could quote the commandment and not give the promise, or he could quote the promise and not the commandment, but he chose to say the first commandment *with* promise. I cannot see the force of my opponent's criticism. While he quotes the first commandment that is given with promise, he does not quote the promise. Hence, as far as the promise recorded by Paul is concerned, it may be the prolongation of the present life or future life in the "new earth."*PSDS 58.1*

Is there not a difference between all the families of the land and all the families of the earth? Does not the phrase "the earth" embrace a much larger scope than the phrase "the land?" My opponent overlooked the whole force and object of the criticism. It is his design to confine his argument to the New Testament. In his last two speeches he refers almost exclusively to the New Testament; but I shall now strike at the *two law* system, and in so doing I shall strike at the real issue between us.*PSDS 58.2*

Jeremiah 44:23. My opponent says I overlooked the point he made, and substituted another. But I have taken the premise from which his conclusions were deducted from him; consequently his conclusions are worthless. The only proof he adduced to show that Jeremiah referred to the ten commandments, was the use of the terms "voice of God," "testimonies," etc. But I have shown that these terms are applied to all the commandments written in the "law of Moses," by the finger of Moses.*PSDS 58.3*

Nor has he adduced a single text of Scripture to prove that the transgression of the ten commandments necessitated the introduction of the ceremonial law. One assumption cannot prove another. Prove the pre-existence of the ten commandments, and it will then be time to make their fore-ordained existence the basis of an argument. Moreover, the fourth commandment was ceremonial in its nature; hence he could have only nine to transgress before the introduction of ceremonies. His criticism, therefore, is against him. My opponent labors to prove two kinds of covenants, one of *law*—the other of *promise*; both of which, I freely admit, the Bible teaches. But he certainly will not claim that the Sinaitic covenant was of both kinds. Well, he has repeatedly admitted that the ten commandments were the covenant; and he claims that they were a law; consequently, he must believe that they were a covenant of law. In reference to the covenant made with Abraham, and commanded to a thousand generations, God leaves no room for discussion. He tells us just what it was; i.e., the promised inheritance. God and my opponent cannot both be right. My Opponent has admitted that the ten commandments were the covenant, and I will now call your attention to the nature of this covenant. In my remarks, last evening, I read to you that the ten commandments were the covenant itself. He will try to prove that the covenant has ceased, by assuming that the Sinaitic covenant was given as a covenant of agreement. I wish to delay a little longer in the Old Testament, for I claim my right to answer an affirmatively proving a negative. And I have the rules and usages of the best debaters in the world. The Bible is the only evidence in the case, and I am not bound to travel as fast as he does.*PSDS 58.4*

"And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only *ye heard* a voice.

And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, *even* ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." *Deuteronomy 4:12, 13*.*PSDS 59.1*

My opponent concludes that wherever the phrase "voice of God" is used, it means the ten commandments. But all the commandments and prophesies are called the voice of God.*PSDS 59.2*

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel." *Exodus 34:27*.*PSDS 59.3*

Now, to make it the covenant and the condition of the covenant, is equivalent to making it the conditions of itself.*PSDS 59.4*

"Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which He made with you, and make you a graven image, *or* the likeness of any *thing* which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee." *Deuteronomy 4:23*.*PSDS 60.1*

Now, to make a graven image or likeness of anything, was to violate the covenant. Also,*PSDS 60.2*

"If there be found among you, within any of thy gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, man or woman that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of the Lord thy God, in transgressing his covenant, and hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the sun, or moon, or any of the host of heaven, which I have not commanded—"*Deuteronomy 17:2, 3*.*PSDS 60.3*

Now, to worship any other god, was a transgression of the covenant upon the principle than the covenant and the ten commandments were identical. You will see, after a little, that much will turn upon the Bible definition of the Sinaitic covenant. *Joshua 7:2*, had violated the first commandment; also, *chap. 23:12*; also, *1 Kings 8:9*. Compare *Hebrews 4:4*, and you will find that they are called the tables of the covenant. It is not my intention to misquote a single passage of Scripture, therefore, I will turn and read it. Upon the principle that the covenant was written upon the two tables of stone, they were called the tables of the covenant. Now, there was nothing written on the tables of stone except the ten commandments;

therefore, the ten commandments are the covenant. Now, if you will turn to the *24. chap. of Exodus, 1-8*, you will find that after God had spoken the ten commandments, Moses was called up into the Mount, and then Moses came down from the Mount and wrote all the commandments God had given, in a book, and that book is called the book of the covenant. I wish to show you just what the Old Testament writers say, and just what they mean; so I will turn to the chapter and read.*PSDS 60.4*

"And he said unto Moses, come up unto the Lord, thou, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and worship ye afar off. And Moses alone shall come near the Lord; but they shall not come nigh; neither shall the people go up with him. And Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do. And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, all the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient. And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people, and said: Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath male with you concerning all these words."*PSDS 60.5*

Now let me read to you a number of commandments which were included with the covenant, and mark, there is no limitation in regard to all the commandments of God; for said the people, "*all* the words which the Lord hath said will we do." But my time is so near up I can only cite your attention to *Exodus 22:2*, to prove that the ten commandments were included in the "book of the covenant," with the promise to resume this in another speech.*PSDS 61.1*

FIFTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—Again, my beloved friends, we are permitted to purse our investigation. I shall, with very few preliminary remarks, proceed to the introduction of passages of Scripture which I have marked as worthy your attention. In the first place, I wish to notice some errors into which my opponent appears to have fallen. I have not stated any difference, nor have I claimed any difference between Exodus and Deuteronomy, as quoted by myself. Again, he seemed to misrepresent my position in reference to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, as if I had tried to introduce arguments showing an identity between the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and the fourth commandment itself. This is by no means what I endeavored to prove. It was the identity of the fourth commandment Sabbath with the Sabbath of the Lord. He said that in so doing I was going beyond the proper limits of the discussion; but, to acknowledge this would be in effect acknowledging that there was no such identity. But I deny this, or that he has introduced any Scripture showing that there was any distinction.*PSDS 61.2*

He wonders at my moving forward so fast into the New Testament; but I will just state, in regard to this, that I have got just as much Bible before me as my opponent. I have all the Old Testament as well as the New, and I intend to use them both conjointly. Moreover, I must be allowed to take my own course. If my opponent had known just the precise course I was going to take in this discussion, it might possibly have saved him some suspense, as well as not a few words; but I can't help that. As I before remarked, he must allow me to take my own course.*PSDS 61.3*

I will now call your attention to *Romans 3*. The righteousness of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ, is to all that do the law——to declare the same time his righteousness, etc. Now, mark, there is something necessary for God to be just. He would be just in judging by the oracles, only providing that these oracles are not made void, and not otherwise. The justice of God, in this matter, is only made contingent upon the perpetuity of the oracles. Now, mark the 31st verse. This is not an exact expression of the original Greek; by no means. [Whiting's translation here referred to.—Reporter.] Now we

want to examine *what* law is established by faith in Jesus Christ, and is not made void. Is it the law of faith? No. Is it the law of Christ? No. Well, is it by the law of Christ that we would be justified? No. Is it by the law of faith? No. What then? It must be a law made before. Justification must come by another means. Very well; then it is not the law of Christ, neither is it the law of faith, but it is another law in which the Jew rested, and that is not made void, but under which all are under condemnation. And the Old Testament scriptures were written while that law was in force. By this declaration of the Scriptures, Paul proves them all sinners. *Romans 3:13*. Now, *3:31*, I ask, does faith in Christ make void the law? No. It shows our obligation to keep that law. How is that law vindicated? God would sacrifice His own dear Son rather than that law should be set aside. He could not save man in any other way and vindicate His law. Therefore the law is not made void by or through faith, but is established. Now, it is not a *part* of a law here spoken of, but *the law*—that is, the law which has been transgressed. This law is not made void by faith. Now, turn to *Ephesians 2*. When we get prepared, we shall see whether the two Testaments agree on that point. 14th and 15th verses. Now, what is meant by "the middle wall of partition?" "—Even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." What has He done with that law? He has abolished it. But what has He done with that other law of Romans? We cannot read it abolished also, but what is affirmed of *the* law in one place is as distinctly denied of *the* law in the other. It is the work of Christ that Paul refers to in both cases. And here, beloved friends, we consider that there is a New Testament fact nailed to a certainty, and we wish to have your attention. We are not confined to the Old Testament to show the perpetuity of the law; by no means, although we go back there to show when this law was made.*PSDS 62.1*

I have produced what I considered sufficient testimony to show the existence of two laws—the one abolished at the advent of Christ, and the other not. My opponent claims that he can show there is no distinction between those two laws. If he can, well and good, for it is the negative of my proposition. But, as he was cut short in his argument, I cannot notice it at the present time.*PSDS 63.1*

The passage before quoted from Ephesians says that the middle wall of partition was broken down, and we understand this to be the

law of ordinances as distinct from the law of the ten commandments. Whatever could distinguish the Jew from the Gentile would be broken down; but whatever could not so distinguish them would not be so broken down. We understand that this is the design or end of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—to reconcile man to his God. It is to bring him back to obedience to the Father. This is the work of Jesus Christ.*PSDS 63.2*

We find other declarations that are exact parallels of these. *Ephesians 2:17*—not only to those afar off, but to those that were nigh. He is for both parties. "For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father," etc.——no more strangers and foreigners, etc. Foreigners from what?—Commencing at the *12th verse*: "—ye (the Gentiles) were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel." *Verse 19*. Because they were aliens and foreigners, therefore they must be brought into obedience to the principles upon which the commonwealth of Israel was established. And because they brought forth the fruits of their [good living,] they are no longer strangers and foreigners, but citizens. Well, we see in the 3rd chapter, *6th verse*, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs and partakers with the Jews. The division that had existed was broken down; they should be one in Christ Jesus and fellow citizens in the commonwealth of Israel. Now, I ask, would it be possible to take these two chapters and predicate the existence of two laws? It is *the* law in each case, and not a *part* of the law. This is testimony of the most positive kind. We shall see if there be any facts in the *Old* Testament that overturn what the *New* says. We have the most positive testimony in the New Testament that there was a law that has been abolished, and also one that has not been made void. I would like to produce a parallel between some other scriptures, but *Romans 2*. and *Ephesians 3*. are all that I now have time to present. We rest this with you for the present, but shall proceed eventually to the examination of other scriptures in their order.*PSDS 63.3*

SIXTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—In a former speech, my opponent alluded to the preface I wish him to place upon his chart of the ten commandments, and said, in effect, that it amounted to this: The Lord thy God brought thee out of Egypt, therefore He wants you to keep the ten commandments. For one, I would be perfectly satisfied with such a preface; but I had rather they would give the one that is already prefixed to the ten commandments in the book. Now, let me see if I cannot find one commandment that has just such a reason for its observance. "Thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence," etc.; "therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath." *Deuteronomy 5:15*. Now, if this reason can be applied to Gentiles as well as Jews, I would be perfectly satisfied. The reason for the ten is equally Israelitish. *Deuteronomy 5:6*; *Exodus 20:2*.*PSDS 64.1*

He urges that I have misrepresented him in my criticism on his want of discrimination. But he neither gives the substance nor the language as I intended to be understood. If I am very critical, as he sometimes intimates that I am, I was certainly very unfortunate in my criticism at that time, he being the judge.*PSDS 64.2*

I said that he had overlooked the real issue in his criticism on my remarks, and had confounded the reason why a certain day (the seventh) was chosen, and the reason why a commandment to observe that day as a sabbath was given. And I still think he has confounded this plain distinction in all his arguments. Moreover, it has seemed to me that he has avoided the real issue and still continues to avoid it. I stated that I believed there was harmony between the two versions of the ten commandments in Deuteronomy and Exodus. He was the one who called upon me to read from Exodus, and if he believes *Deuteronomy 5* and *Exodus 20* are the same, why did he once say they were different? If they are an unit, why claim a difference? It is painful to dwell upon these little matters, but I can see no other way when I am accused of misrepresenting. I said that he avoided the real issue, and I will say the same of his last two speeches—they are not to the point in dispute. He thinks that he has shown the existence of two laws, and has got up a plain distinction between them; but, admitting that he

has done so, and admitting that he can go on and prove that one of those laws has been abolished, and that the other has not been abolished, has he, even then, proved any thing in regard to the real issue? We claim that he has not. Admitting that his distinction between two laws is founded on the plain word of God, instead of his criticisms, he yet has something to do—something farther to show. Suppose that he has shown the existence of two laws. I deny that the ten commandments have been perpetuated. I am aware that this is what he may call a singular way of drawing inferences, but I can't help it. He assumes, first, that the ten commandments are a law, and then that they are *the* law; and if this is all the argument that he can bring to the affirmative of the issue, I confess I can see no need of continuing this discussion at all. But as I am sometimes accused of being a little unreasonable, I will try and wait till I am fully convinced. Elder Waggoner assumed, yesterday afternoon, I think it was, that the ten commandments, apart from all other precepts, were a perfect code or law, and I was in hopes that he would at least try to sustain this position by argument; but I have hoped and waited in vain. I might pass this by in silence; but as he has repeatedly called the ten commandments a law, I will avail myself of this opportunity of not only denying that they are ever recognized as a separate law, but of showing that their proof texts do not sustain the assumption. *Exodus 24:12* is referred to by my opponent as proof. It reads thus: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written. "Note, 1st. This verse contains three promises, the first of which included the ten commandments, viz., the tables of stone. The tables had the ten commandments written upon them when the Lord gave them unto Moses. Proof—*Exodus 24:18*. 2nd. A law. 3rd. Commandments. And in the fourth place, the Lord declares that He had written the whole of them. From the 25th to the 31st chapters, we find a fulfilment of the *second* two promises, and at the *18th verse of the 31st chapter*, of the *first*. Will my opponent affirm that the hundred commandments given previous to the tables containing the ten were not a fulfilment of the promise made in *chapter 24:12*? That the Lord wrote the ten commandments upon the first tables by an angel, and upon the second tables by Moses, will appear by comparing *Acts 7:37, 38*, with *Exodus 34:24, 28*.*PSDS 64.3*

Matthew 5:17-19 was referred to by my opponent as another proof text. He argued that the 21st and 27th verses—in which two of the ten commandments are quoted—prove that Christ was commenting upon the law of ten commandments. But the same parity of reasoning would prove the perpetuity of all the commandments written [in?] the "Book of the Law;" for Christ quotes more commandments which were written exclusively in the book than He does of the ten. But my opponent quotes the penalties attached by Christ to these commandments, to prove that the original ten commandments prohibited adultery and fornication. But were there any such penalties attached to the ten commandments or any other commandments in the Old Testament? Could God hold the Israelites responsible for the teachings of Christ hundreds of years in the future? But upon my opponent's hypothesis, Abraham, David, and the holy men of old were egregious sinners, for living in adultery. Try it again, friend Waggoner.*PSDS 66.1*

My opponent assumes that the phrase "*the law*" means the ten commandments only. I have as good a right to assume that the phrase "the prophets" means only *ten* of the prophets. But that these terms are used in their widest sense, to denote *all* the law (yes, all the hundreds of commandments written in the book) and *all* the prophets, will appear by comparing this with other places where the same terms occur. In *Matthew 11:13*, we find the same terms used again by our Savior. It reads thus: "For all the *prophets* and t h e *law* prophesied until John." Did the ten commandments prophesy? No; but in the book of the law were written prophesies. Again, *Matthew 22:35-40* is quoted to prove the perpetuity of the ten commandments. But mark the analogy between the question and the answer: "Which is the great *commandment* in the law?" Verge 36th. Christ then repeats the two great precepts of love to God, and love to our neighbor, and then says, "On these two command-hang all the law and the *prophets*." *Verse 40th*. All what law? The ten commandments, my opponent will tell you. But were these all the law? Were they a law at all? This remains to be proved. It will then be time for him to press this text into his service. Mark—it was the great commandment in the law, in reference to which the lawyer propounded his question. Christ then quoted the two precepts I have just read. But were these two commandments among the ten? No. Were they written upon tables of stone?

Answer, no. They were written exclusively in the book. The same argument, therefore, which would prove the perpetuity of the ten commandments, because they were included in the law, which was suspended upon these two great precepts, would prove the perpetuity of all the commandments which were written in that great system, the “book of the law.” My opponent says it will be admitted that the first four commandments are included in love to God, and the last six in love to our neighbor. It will not be admitted by me. I am not under obligation to love my neighbor, or kill him, or steal from him, or bear false witness against him, or covet his wife or his property. No, they do not enforce love. They were not designed to regulate the affections of men, but merely to restrain their overt conduct. [Time up.]*PSDS 66.2*

SEVENTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—It is of course true that a statement affirmed is not worth anything till it is proved, and if the other overthrows the affirmative, it is of course good for nothing. Now, the ten commandments are a law spoken of distinct from all other laws, and we read that it was spoken by the voice of God. The testimony is that God did not *speak* any more, and there is no evidence that God *wrote* any more than the ten commandments. But my opponent claims that God did not write them at all—they were written by an angel. If I thought myself really mistaken, I might stop in my argument and notice my friend's position. He thinks an angel wrote the law, but I cannot see that an angel could have written the law of the ten commandments any more than he could have written what Moses wrote. *Exodus 31:12-18*. Now is it admissible to read "an angel" for the "the Lord" in this instance? Have we any evidence that the ten commandments were written by proxy—by an angel, instead of "with the finger of God," as this Scripture plainly declares? We have none. There was an angel there when it was written, but that does not prove that an angel wrote the law. We might, with equal propriety, claim that it was written by Moses, because Moses was there. *Exodus 31:16*. —*Deuteronomy 33:2*, etc. But let us look at *Psalm 68:17*. We believe there were many angels there, but the Lord was among them. Now, the claim that because an angel was on Mount Sinai, therefore the Lord did not do as He said He did, is poor argument certainly.*PSDS 67.1*

It is indeed a matter of regret that we have to go over and over the same ground so many times. Now, it is no more true that the ten commandments area Jewish law because they were given to those that came up out of the land of Egypt, than it is that the God who gave these commandments was or is only the God of those who came out of the land of Egypt. I have thus far failed to get my opponent to read the fourth commandment. He will neither quote directly from Exodus or Deuteronomy. I must say that I hope we shall not be under the necessity of going back to examine such points again.*PSDS 68.1*

We will now turn our attention to some texts in the New Testament,

and I will go a little farther in my argument, which, by the way, my opponent has not yet touched. The phrase “the law” refers to different things at different times, or it does not. If I can show a distinction between the signification of the term law in one place and the same term in another place, then I shall have proved the existence of two separate laws. But my failure to establish the fact of two separate laws will be “published to the world,” as my opponent says. My defeat will be “published to the world” in language unmistakable. The hottest part of the battle will have been fought and victory forthwith declared to the negative of our proposition. We will see.*PSDS 68.2*

Turn again to Romans, where Paul is arguing a distinction between two laws—*7:14*, etc. Now, we will look at the declaration in *Hebrews 7:16*. The law of the carnal commandments was abolished—was broken down. Now, *Romans 3:19* proves that that law was spoken to the whole world. Then, in *Ephesians 3*., instead of governing the whole world, this law or middle wall of partition was broken down. Here is a marked difference between the two laws, one of which was declared to be broken down or abolished. Now, we will look at *James 2:10-12*, and see if we have got a law abolished there. [Reads.] I have before endeavored to establish the fact that when the middle wall of partition was broken down, Jesus Christ brought them all into subjection to the principle or law on which the commonwealth of Israel was based. *Verse 8-11*, etc. Here he is again in harmony with the law of God. The condition of the kingdom is obedience to the equal law. It is according to this scripture that they are to fulfil the royal law, or they cannot be heirs of the kingdom—*11th verse*—because the law is an unit. He that said, “Thou shalt not commit adultery” said also, “Thou shalt not kill.” If thou kill, thou art become “a transgressor of the law.” Very well; then this is to be fulfilled according to that scripture which says “thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” and this is the law by which they are to be judged. By taking the second chapter of Romans, we have shown that this is the very law by which God will judge the world. Here [on his card, I suppose.—Reporter.] is the one by which they shall be judged. But this other law is spoken of in *Colossians 2:14*, etc. Now, here are the ordinances exactly declared in *Ephesians 2:15*. But there is something that is not abolished. The law of ordinances is taken out of the way and nailed to the cross,

but the other is not taken out of the way. Between Romans and Ephesians, and farther between Matthew and Ephesians, we institute a comparison, and infer the existence of two laws. “I am not come to destroy,” etc., “but to fulfil.” Haying abolished in His flesh even the law contained in ordinances. But there is a law which has not been abolished, and here it is. [On his card, I suppose.—Reporter.] But, says one, do you not see that He has given a new condition that does not appear on the tables of stone? If He did not destroy them or nail them to the cross, they must still be in effect. Now, my opponent will claim that because Christ has got some commandments that were *not* written on the tables of stone, therefore He has reversed all that *were* written. I am not willing to admit that an individual could hate his neighbor in any particular and still keep the ten commandments. I do not believe that a man can love God with all his heart and still hate his neighbor. God blesses them that love Him and keep His commandments, and they are to love Him according to the letter of the commandments. My opponent says he can keep the six commandments and not love his neighbor; but I do not believe any such position can be assumed and maintained. He charges me with making assumptions, but I claim there has been more assumed on that side of the question than can be sustained by quotations from the word of God. Many of my opponent’s assertions certainly cannot be successfully supported by scripture. We have the testimony of the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, that the Lord wrote on the tables of stone with His own fingers, and we have the confession of our opponent that nothing save these ten commandments were written on the tables of stone; therefore God must have written them Himself with His finger. *Romans 5:19*, etc. The entering of a law that the offense might abound must be the entering of the same law that was violated, because you cannot make a man sensible of committing an offence against a law in reference to which he had no previous knowledge. We think we have proved from the Scriptures that this means the law that was confirmed to them at Mount Sinai. vi. 1, 2, etc. By that are we to presume that we are to do every thing commanded in the Old Testament? By no means. The law of ordinances was abolished.*PSDS 68.3*

But I would like to notice *Romans 5:19* a little more particularly. What is sin? Now, I consider that sin is disobedience of law.

Obedience is not the transgression of the law, certainly. Hence, the keeping of the law is the opposite of transgression. Jesus Christ came to bring man to obedience. Shall we continue in disobedience that sin may abound? By no means. [Time up.]*PSDS 70.1*

EIGHTEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—He will be misrepresenting me all the time. He misrepresents *himself* at least half the time. He referred to the fifth commandment, and not only referred to it, but read it. The words fourth commandment were not mentioned at all when he requested me to read, or, if so, they were inaudible. He referred to the *fifth* commandment, (as in the 20th of Exodus,) and wanted to know why I did not read it. We do not want to jangle here just for the sake of jangling. He says truly, I have several times said that I will publish this discussion to the world, but the other I deny. He did not refer to *Exodus 34:27, 28*. I believe that Moses did write them, and that what God does by His agent, He does Himself. Stephen declares that it was an angel spoke in the mount. *Acts 7:38*. This varies slightly from the reading of the same by my opponent, but I do not accuse him of being a knave, as he has several times accused me, at least in effect, if not in those very words. I think these are personalities unworthy a discussion of this kind.*PSDS 70.2*

Acts 7:30. There an angel spoke for the great I Am—God by His agent. Now, why did he not emphasize this as it should be emphasized? Again I say it is an easy matter for a man to overlook the real issue.*PSDS 71.1*

Turn to *Galatians 3:19*. Paul says the law was ordained by angels. Moses uses the Hebrew word *Elohim*, which is rendered gods and *angels* in other places. God made His covenant with Abraham by an angel; and Jesus Christ authorized an angel to speak in His proper person. *Revelation 1:1, 18*. What God said and did by His agent, He said and did Himself. What Jesus Christ said by His agent, He said Himself. God not only spake by His angel, but He spake in times past by the prophets. *Hebrews 1:1*. Just so with the writing of the commandments. God wrote them and the angel wrote them. Take the inflexible position that God wrote the ten commandments and that the angel had no hand in it, and reconcile it with *Hebrews 1:1*.*PSDS 71.2*

Matthew 5. Mark the law here spoken of by Jesus is not the ten commandments exclusively, but the book of the law. My opponent

says whenever He quoted any of the other commandments He abolished or repealed them. [Reads.] Did Jesus declare it of the ten commandments that the heavens and earth should pass before one jot or tittle of them should be left unfulfilled? But suppose He did abolish these commandments: does it prove that He did not enforce them before they were repealed? There is nothing in the seventh commandment that proves a man guilty of adultery who has only looked on a woman to lust after her. God could not in justice hold a man responsible or amenable to these precepts of Jesus Christ under the ten commandments, for they do not contain the principles He enforced. But my opponent asks if a man can keep God's commandment without loving Him? He claims that if we keep the ten commandments, we shall love the Lord our God with all our hearts, and our neighbors as ourselves. According to his view of the subject, a man cannot keep the ten commandments without loving his neighbor as himself. But mark, this precept is not in the ten commandments; it is only found in the book; and to confound the two is to make the two the same, which he denies I'm to do. *Matthew 5:17* again. [Reads.] According to Campbell's translation, "Heaven and earth shall sooner perish than one iota or tittle of the law shall perish without attaining its end." Now, this teaches that, having attained its end, it must perish, which would be altogether superfluous language if it never should perish. The law and the prophets are here used in conjunction. Turn to *Luke 24:44*. I will not consume time by reading it; but it appears that all things which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets and in the Psalms concerning Jesus were to be fulfilled in His resurrection. Here "the law and prophets" prophesy.*PSDS 71.3*

Well, you will probably hear, before you get through, that the ten commandments are a school master to bring us to Christ. Now, if it is the design of the ten commandments to bring us to Christ, we must conclude that when that design is fulfilled, they will cease.*PSDS 72.1*

I will now call your attention to a few passages of scripture in support of the negative side of our question, inasmuch as my opponent has freely admitted that if I *prove* the negative, then the affirmative will of course be overthrown. He has shown you that a law of ordinances has been abolished by a comparison of Romans

and Ephesians. But what becomes of the Sinaitic covenant, which my opponent declared or admitted to be the ten commandments? I wish to read enough scripture to place the whole matter beyond dispute. *Galatians 3:10* and *Exodus 24:1-3*. By reference to the first quotation, you will find that the commandments God had given up to that time, including the ten, were written in the book, and called the "book of the covenant." In the last quotation, it is called the "book of the law." My opponent claims that "the law," the "schoolmaster" referred to in the third chapter of Galatians, is the ten commandments. Are the ten commandments the "book of the law?" By reference to the *16th and 17th verses*, we may learn when the (which is claimed to the ten commandments) law originated, *i.e.*, four hundred and thirty years after the Abrahamic covenant. This synchronizes, in point of time, with the time the ten commandments were published on Mount Sinai, and declared to be God's covenant; and also that this covenant was not made with the fathers, (*i.e.*, the ten commandments were not given to the fathers with whom the Abrahamic covenant was made.) By reference to the *17th verse*, we learn how long the law was to continue—namely, "Till the seed should come to whom the promise (*i.e.*, the promise covenanted to Abraham's seed—Christ—*verse 16*) was made." This harmonizes with the termination of "the schoolmaster," (which is used as the equivalent of the "book of the law," *verse 10*, and "the law," *verse 17*,) whose office was to "bring us to Christ." Hence we learn definitely the time when the law commenced, and the time when it terminated. But my opponent says that to be "under the law," *verse 23*, is not to be amenable to the law, but to be under its penalty. Did Paul's brethren desire to die? Did they desire to be under the penalty, which was death? *Chapter 4:21*. Is it the office of a schoolmaster to kill his pupils, or to teach them? The latter, of course. So with the law. By reference to *chapter 4:22-30*, it will be seen that the Sinaitic covenant and the Abrahamic covenant are represented by the "bond woman and her son," and the "free woman and her son." At the *30th verse*, the bond woman and her son, (*i.e.*, the Sinaitic covenant, which has been proved to be the ten commandments,) are represented as being cast out to make room for the free woman and her son—*i.e.*, the Abrahamitic covenant, as the basis of the Gentile believer's hope. And to show that this transition has actually taken place, Paul, including Gentile believers with himself, declares that they were "not children of the

bondwoman, but of the free." *Verse 31*.*PSDS 72.2*

In the foregoing quotation of Scripture, the Sinaitic covenant—the ten commandments—is cast out, abolished, preparatory to the incorporation of Gentile believers into the Abrahamitic covenant, and constituting them joint heirs, with Abraham and Christ, to the promised inheritance. *Galatians 3:16-29*. Of the same import [original illegible] Paul's teaching in *Hebrews 8:13*. In *chapter 9:19-22*, he quotes from *Exodus 24:1-8*, where the Sinaitic covenant is written [original illegible] the book; hence it is called the book of the covenant. From the 1st to the 5th verses of *Hebrews 9th* chapter, he contrasts the first and second covenants—the *Sinaitic* and the *new*. That we may not mistake his application of the first covenant, he refers to the covenant written upon tables—*i.e.*, the tables of the covenant. *Verse 4*. In *chapter 8:13*, he declares that this "first covenant" (*i.e.*, the ten commandments) was ready to vanish away. [Time up.]*PSDS 73.1*

NINETEENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—Respected audience, again I appear before you to address you from God's word upon the truth which we have been from time to time examining. God's word is truth. When last I was before you, I was considering *Romans 6*. in reference to the law which Paul says was not made void by faith. *Chapter 3:31*. But the faith of our Lord does not make void the law. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" Now, if grace has abounded, we are dead to sin, which is a transgression of the law: hence we are dead to transgression. *Chapter 6:12-14*. But the reason of this is given in *verse 11*. Dead to the transgression of the law of God, but alive unto God. Dead to God while we are in the transgression of His law and alive to sin. We cannot be dead to sin and alive to sin at the same time. Being alive to God is not the transgression of His law. Dead in trespasses and sins, but alive to God. We pass from that state of deadness to God when we are living in sin, to become alive to God by obeying His law. *Verse 14*. Instead of being under the dominion of the law, or under obligation to keep the law, we are under grace. Is that so? What is the declaration in the next verse? [Reads.] Then perhaps my opponent will argue the observance of it is without obligation, because they were not under obligation to keep it. But if he uses it to show there's a force in using it also to show They are taken out of that state which is a state of condemnation, and placed in a state of favor. An individual may be under obligation to keep the law, and still not be in the favor of God. Now, everybody has the favor of God till they forfeit it. When they forfeit the favor of God, it is because [original illegible] transgression or disobedience of His law. When a person is under grace, he is not under condemnation, and *vice versa*. If the obligation was fulfilled, they certainly would be under grace. Now, you are not under the law, having been held by the law to be a condemned individual. Shall we transgress the law because we are under favor or grace? God forbid. *Verse 16*. They are not under the law but under grace. If they again transgress the law, they are no longer servants of grace. When they transgress the law, they cease to be servants of grace, and are servants of sin. The sinner is brought out from a state of condemnation under the law, and placed under grace. This is a plain proposition clearly argued by the Apostle Sin being the transgression of the law, when we cease to

sin we are placed under grace, that is, we are justified. But if we go back into sin, or bring ourselves under condemnation, we are not alive to grace any more than we should be if we had never been brought under grace at all.*PSDS 74.1*

But there is another declaration that we wish to notice. It has been proposed that this law has perished or come to an end. Nod the only Scripture that has any thing of the sound of that is *Romans 10:4*. Now, if Christ has become the end of the law in such a manner that we need not keep the law, it must be a fact, that it is countermanded to the unbeliever as well as to the believer, unless Jesus came into the world on certain conditions, that the law is made void when a person is freed from sin. Would the Son become the end of the law to those who do not believe? James says, in speaking of the trials of Job, “Ye have seen the design or object of the Lord.” So the salvation of souls is the end or object of faith, and in a certain sense, it is also the end of the law. Suppose that the ten commandments are cast out; who is the declaration? Christ has, of course, released every one who believes, but he has not released those who have not. My idea of Christ is, that he came to take away the carnal mind that is not subject to the law, and take away those principles of conduct that would prevent man from yielding obedience to the law. It was stated here this afternoon that man might keep the commandments of God without loving Him, or that man could love God without keeping His commandments; but I cannot believe that the faith of Christ affords us any opportunity to dispense with those precepts. The opposite of transgression of the law is stated in the text as being a condition of grace or favor with God. Do you believe that the object of the law was that man should obey it or disobey it at pleasure, and still be a subject of God’s grace or favor? If Jesus’ death was to release us from obedience to the law of God, this object is accomplished; but, is this a true position?*PSDS 75.1*

We are free to admit that we are *justified* by the law in no sense whatever. All our future obedience is not our own. We receive strength and power from God to go on and sin no more. The design of the law is accomplished. God teaches its perpetuity in the clearest possible manner, when, rather than have that law changed, He would let His dear Son come and die for our transgressions.

Every one that transgresses the Divine law must die, or else Jesus Christ, the substitute, must die. Mankind might all die, for all were under condemnation, but God chose rather to sacrifice His own dear Son than abrogate his law. Jews and Gentiles were equally under condemnation. God could have kept His Son alive and let man perish; or He could have kept His Son alive and saved man by abolishing His law. Rather than do either, He would let His dear Son perish upon the cross—let Him suffer and die that whosoever would believe in Him might have everlasting life. This is my view. All the Apostle's argument goes to show that the law is not made void through faith in Jesus Christ, but that it is established. God suffered His own dear Son to die rather than that His law should be trampled upon with impunity. If we esteem the law lightly, we must hold redemption through faith in Jesus Christ lightly also. And if we esteem the Gospel plan of redemption lightly, we shall also think lightly of obedience to the law of God. Our views of the Gospel must be regulated by our views of God's law, for one does not come in conflict with the other. The Gospel always teaches obedience to the law.*PSDS 76.1*

TWENTIETH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—Still alive, my friends, to vindicate what I believe is God's truth.*PSDS 76.2*

My opponent, it appears, would have you think that we do not believe in any law at all—that a man may do almost anything, provided the ten commandments were abolished, or rather, that a man may commit almost any sin and still love God supremely and his neighbor as himself. This we do not claim. We claim that the ten commandments are not a perfect law to regulate our affections at all. Now, I ask, do not they of the affirmative have to refer to the law of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, to prove any man guilty of fornication, of adultery, of drunkenness or of any sin not expressly forbid in the ten commandments? Most certainly they do. They cannot get along without the law of Christ. In all the reasoning of my opponent, he has assumed that the ten commandments are a perfect law, and I have, from the first, denied it. As I said in the early part of this discussion, let him bring one plain "Thus saith the Lord" in support of this assumption, and I will yield the point.*PSDS 77.1*

Now it is his duty to prove that the precept of the fourth commandment is perpetuated through the present age. I shall wait till he takes a position on Romans, and makes an application of his reasonings. When he can show that the precept of the fourth commandment is *once* enforced in the New Testament, I will agree to keep the very next Saturday or seventh day for a sabbath. But I can prove that the ten commandments have been abolished. The ten commandments were God's covenant with the children of Israel. God's covenant with that people has been done away with, and if that covenant has been done away with, the ten commandments have perished with it, and are not obligatory on any people upon the face of the earth, by virtue of their fore-ordained authority. The law referred to in Galatians was added four hundred and thirty years after the Abrahamic covenant, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*PSDS 77.2*

"The object of the schoolmaster is plainly stated, namely, to bring us to Christ." This we admit. But when faith—*i.e.*, the "promised seed," Christ—is come, we are no longer under the dominion of the

schoolmaster.*PSDS 77.3*

But he is anxious that I shall find a law that has been abolished; and according to his view, he has found a law that has not been abolished, which he assumes to be the ten commandments. But assertions will not pass for evidence in this discussion. One plain Bible statement is all that I have asked. Is not this reasonable? My opponent has agreed to yield the point, if I can show one "thus saith the Lord" proving the abolition of the ten commandments. I accept the offer, and will attempt the easy task. By reference to *2 Corinthians 3:9, 10*, we find the two ministrations contrasted in the following language: "For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, by reason of the glory that excelleth." By reference to *verses 11th and 13th*, we find that the first ministration —"the ministration of death," "of condemnation," etc.—was done away—was abolished. "For if that (ministration) which was done away was glorious, much more that (ministration) which remaineth is glorious. And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end (*i.e.*, Christ—*Romans 10:4*,) of that (ministration) which is abolished." By referring to the *7th verse*, we learn what this ministration (which was done away) was and where it was written. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven on stones," etc. Here is positive proof that what was written upon stones was "done away—abolished." Can my opponent show any plainer testimony for the origin of the ten commandments than I have here shown for their abolition. Can he show anything to compare with it, in positiveness, to prove the perpetuity of the ten commandments, or the fourth, through the Christian age? No; he knows he cannot. In reference to the abolition of the glory of Moses' face, we shall have no dispute. But we both admit that the contrast is between the two ministrations —*i.e.*, the "ministration of death" and "the ministration of the Spirit," of "condemnation and righteousness," etc.; and according to every just rule of language, and every grammar in the world, the first ministration (not death, but the ministration of death) was written upon stones; and the Apostle positively declares that this ministration was done away—abolished." Can anything be plainer? I will give Campbell's version of *2 Corinthians 3:7*: "For if the ministration of death in letters engraved on stones was with glory," etc. Here the ministration was in letters engraved on stones. What

was engraved on stones? The ten commandments, all agree. Then if this ministration was done away, the ten commandments must of course have been done away. There is no averting this conclusion.*PSDS 77.4*

But it is urged that if we believe the ten commandments were abolished, we have a right to steal and kill, and bear false witness, etc. I answer, if the teachings of Christ and His Apostles will permit these sins, then we are at liberty to do these things. But I will show, before this discussion closes, that the principles of all the moral precepts in the Old Testament Scriptures are enforced in the New Testament, by Christ and His Apostles, and additional commandments more high toned and strict, and *nine* out of the *ten*. The question will be asked, how many of the ten commandments are binding in the Christian dispensation? I answer, just as many as have been incorporated into the Christian Constitution. When a new constitution is made, none of the laws of a foreordained constitution are binding by virtue of the authority of the obsolete law, except what is incorporated into the new law; and those by the authority of the new one exclusively. To illustrate: When our forefathers made a new constitution, they copied all the articles of British law which they considered adapted to the wants and duties of the people of these United States; but what judge or justice has ever since enforced such laws by the foreordained authority of British law? What jurist has ever argued the perpetuity of the constitution of England in this country because some of its precepts were incorporated into the constitution of the States?*PSDS 79.1*

This reasoning will apply with equal force to the abrogation of the Mosaic constitution, and the formation of the Christian constitution.*PSDS 79.2*

In reference to the ten commandments being a ministration of death. For the transgression of almost every one of them, the criminal was put to death. Any argument that would prove one of the ten commandments was a ministration of death, would prove that the ten commandments were a ministration of death; for my opponent argues the unity of the law.*PSDS 79.3*

Hebrews 9:1, etc. Now, what was this first commandment?

Manifestly it was the ten commandments. Let my opponent confine himself to the ten commandments, instead of the great law system by which the Israelites were governed. We can find that commandments have been abolished, for we find that those which were written upon the tables of stone were abolished. *Ephesians 2*. I do not believe there is one text of Scripture between the two lids of the Bible to show that the ten commandments are a law. Let them admit this point or bring the plain word of God to the support of their assumption. I wish to keep the real issue before you. We want, and must have a plain "Thus saith the Lord" for evidence in this discussion. Nothing else will answer, for in one man's opinion two portions of Scripture may be analogous, and not in another's. Now, my friends, has my opponent gained the affirmative of this question? I have called upon him to prove from the Bible that the ten commandments are a law, and I shall continue to call upon him to do it. If he can find one passage, and but one, I will pledge myself to keep the very next seventh day that rolls around in the succession of weeks. He shall have all the time he wishes to prove this, but I beg of him to be so considerate as not to base any more arguments upon his assumption of this point in dispute. I deny that the ten commandments are anywhere in the Bible called a law. Let him come to the issue and prove his assumption.*PSDS 79.4*

It seems that my opponent cannot conceive of sin without the transgression of the ten commandments. The ten commandments alone, therefore, can convict a man of sin. The law of God is the law or rule of righteousness. The righteousness of God, therefore, would be manifested only through His law. Hence, faith does not make void the law. But shall we argue the perpetuity of the prophets, also? *Romans 3:21*. "But now the righteousness of God without the law (*i.e.*, without the ten commandments, for my opponent argues that this law is the ten commandments,) is manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." Faith confirms the prophesy of both these witnesses. *Verse 31st*. But what law prophesied? The ten commandments? No. But the Mosaic law, as has been proved. This is the law, therefore, to which Paul refers. This law was a "schoolmaster to bring to Christ." [Time up.]*PSDS 80.1*

TWENTY-FIRST SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I wish to call your attention to an examination of *Colossians 2:11*, respecting what Jesus Christ abolished. We have quoted a scripture from Ephesians, showing what was abolished was concerning ordinances; and we refer to this as a parallel scripture. *Verses 14-17*. I wish to notice what the Apostle has reference to here: "Or of the new moon or of the sabbath days." We are well aware of the position our friends of the negative take on this. They take the position that the sabbath days spoken of in this scripture are the sabbaths or holy days of the Lord. We take the opposite of this—that it must mean particular days. The language used shows that it does not mean *any* holy day, but a *particular* holy day, or in respect of a holy day.—"or of the sabbath days." The same term is used twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and in every case but this it is rendered feast day. And in all the cases but this, you will find it occurring at the time of some of the feast days of the Jewish dispensation. I take the position that there were but three feast days given by the Lord to the Jews. But besides the three feast days spoken of, they also had fifty-two feasts in the year. In *Leviticus 23*., both the feasts of the Lord and the sabbaths of the Lord are enumerated. Here the position will be taken that all the sabbaths enumerated are feasts. [Reads.] I remark here, I say, that the position will be taken that they were therefore all feasts of the Lord. *Verse 37*.*PSDS 80.2*

If the offerings, etc. were confined to the sabbath day, it would be quite another thing. But these are not the feasts that are based on the sabbath of the Lord. *Leviticus 23:14*. How many feast days were they to have in a year? Three. Do you claim that these three feast days were all the holy convocation days? No; they were not. But I claim that they rested from labor on those holy convocation days, though they were not all sabbaths. We find three yearly feast days that are not sabbaths. *Deuteronomy 16:16*. And these are the only three feast days that can be found. There are none to be observed beyond the three. They were to have holy convocation days, and why were they thus called? Were they because the days on which they happened to come were sanctified? The fact that they were to have holy convocations on the sabbath did not sanctify the day, for that was done by God long before. The new moons were distinct

from the [other] feasts. These sabbaths are a shadow of things to come. How many weekly sabbaths in the Bible? Only one. We find several yearly sabbaths, but no more weekly. [Here the speaker called for several books to make an illustration.] Suppose we have the creation symbolized by these books, and Christ by this other pile. We will see what are the shadows of things to come and what are not. Here are those which typify the passover. It belongs to Christ as the antitype. It has come up to Him of whom it was the shadow. We will take all the yearly sabbaths, and we will have them the same. But the sabbath of the fourth commandment invariably points back to the creation, and of course is not the shadow of things to come, but a memorial of something that is past. "Wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." This argument of the Lord in reference to its origin and object I rest with you. We see its origin was before the promise was made that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. It was made when God rested from His labors, and the sanctification is placed there and nowhere else. He sanctified it because He rested on it. It points back as an everlasting memorial of facts eternal in their nature.*PSDS 81.1*

I want to notice the passage my friend cites in 2 Cor., but I have not time to do so now. It is very fortunate when we can investigate a passage of scripture together, for it is very seldom that we are together. He has anticipated me during nearly the whole discussion. He seems to have thrown in a caution upon the minds of the people about believing my definition of things rather than the Bible. But I confess that I am dependent upon a dictionary, and I usually prefer Webster to any other authority. I say that my Bible is not a dictionary of itself. You may teach a boy to read the Bible so that he can compare every term used in the Scriptures, and if he does not understand the meaning of the terms used, he will know nothing of the Bible.*PSDS 82.1*

2 Corinthians 3. No contrast there, except between the places of writing. But suppose we do contrast it? Perhaps, if he was pressed up pretty close, he would wish the contrast made between one-tenth of what was written on the tables of stone and what was written on the fleshly tables of the heart that was not written in the tables of stone and embraced in the first commandment? Is the

contrast of all these precepts written in the fleshly tables of the heart before a man is brought under grace? Is not this a dangerous doctrine? If you could look into the heart of the true Christian and see what is there written, you would by no means get the contrast of the precepts written on the tables of stone. But I suppose all that will be claimed will be a contrast with the fourth commandment; but he has got to claim a contrast with the whole ten, if with any. He must contrast the whole law of God as written in the tables of stone, with that written in the fleshly tables of the Christian's heart. This is the sort of contrast that my opponent has brought into this discussion. Will he continue to contrast the law of God with the heart of the Christian?*PSDS 82.2*

Verse 7, 13. Now, I want to know if it was not the glory of Moses' countenance that was veiled? Were the ten commandments veiled? It says not one word about the tables of stone, but about Moses. But my opponent says the ministration of death is the ministration of the tables of stone. Even admitting that it produced death to those who transgressed it, does that prove that the ten commandments are a ministration of death and to be contrasted with what is written or engraven on the fleshly tablets of the heart when a man is brought under grace? We think not.*PSDS 83.1*

We were not going to notice Romans yet, but since he has based part of his argument on it, and, moreover, quoted or cited it at a passage parallel with this, we will look at it. *Romans 8:2*. Also *7:22-24*. Now, we claim that there are three laws brought in here—the law of God, and the law of sin working on his members, and the law that sets him free. Much, very much, is involved in the consideration of this subject.*PSDS 83.2*

TWENTY-SECOND SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—The verse to which I called the attention of my opponent he has entirely overlooked. But I can easily forgive him for it, as well as for the frequent wrong construction he put upon my remarks and arguments. Now, I will read the verse following after, that you may all know what it is. This point is not new; it has been under investigation ever since the discussion of the sabbatic institution commenced.*PSDS 83.3*

My opponent says the negative here is between or in the places in which it was written, and not between that which was written. *2 Corinthians 3:3*. He says the contrast is not between what is written here, but as to the place it was written. Hence we have the whole ten contrasted with what was written in the heart. Let us read it and see. [Reads.] Now, let me read the context following after. [Reads.] Now, we will read *verse 9*. Is the condemnation that is here referred to the condemnation of Moses' countenance? Would that condemn a man? Is not the contrast between the two ministrations?*PSDS 83.4*

I would ask if the ten commandments may not be ministered as well as any of the other commandments. It was the ministration that was written upon stones, and the ministration was done away. Moses' countenance and the ministration were not the same? If this is not a mere play upon words, I have never seen anything of the kind. Let me read on a little farther. *Verses 9-11*. I submit this to every intelligent grammarian here. Does the word *that* point out Moses' face? What honest man will, for a single moment, contend that *that* refers to anything but the ministration of condemnation mentioned in *v. 9*? What is declared of that ministration? It is done away.*PSDS 84.1*

How long did Moses' countenance continue to be veiled? Any longer than he? It is either a literal veiling of Moses' countenance or it is a symbol of what was written on his hand when his face shone with such brilliancy. *Exodus 34:29*. Moses has been slumbering for 4000 years. Now, does this mean a veil that had dimmed or obscured the vision of the schoolmaster whose office was to lead them to Christ? No need of evasion here. We are answered, No.

But the ministration written upon the stones he had in his hand when his face thus shone. Well, then, there are three laws. There is the law of faith. I don't know but my opponent has three without that. The law written in the fleshly tables of the heart, and the law written on tables of stone. But what was written on the stones? Not death, but the ministration of death, was written on stones, and here it is declared to be done away. Look at *Romans 7:1-4*. Jesus Christ is here said in effect to supercede Moses. *Deuteronomy 18:18*. Moses was a lawgiver by Divine appointment. If a king appoints me to speak for him, I am his agent. Moses and Christ were the divinely appointed heads and lawgivers for the two dispensations. *Verses 17, 18*: "And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in His mouth, and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him." Christ was God's agent to speak the words that God commanded Him, and He spoke them in plain, explicit terms not easily misunderstood, so that all men might be held responsible. *Matthew 3:17*: "And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son; in whom I am well pleased." My friend will say amen to this, no doubt. But hear the voice of the Father once more. *Matthew 17:5*. "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him." The Son being about to ascend to heaven, all power in heaven and earth is given to him. Certainly no more power would be necessary. *Matthew 28:19, 20*. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Jesus taught them commandments that they were to proclaim to the world, after the old commandments had fulfilled their mission and been done away. Obedience to Christ's commandments are presented as the highest development of Christian character. *John 14:15, 21*: "Henceforth I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth; but I have called you friends, for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you. But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not Him that sent me." In the first quotation, obedience to the commandments of Christ is the evidence of our loving Him. In the second, such obedience will secure the love of the Father and the Son. Surely, nothing less than perfect obedience will secure such

glorious privileges. *Verse 23*: “Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me and keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him.” The Father and Son will love and dwell with all who obey the words of Christ. By obedience to Christ’s commandments we evidence our fidelity to Him, as He does to the Father by obedience to His. And are recognized as His friends. *John 15:10, 14*.*PSDS 84.2*

I wish also to show you Jesus Christ as having supreme power and position in the church. *Ephesians 1:22-24*. From this you see that it is God’s plan to have but one head upon one body. Jesus Christ is to be the head of the church in all things. Next notice *Ephesians 5:22-32*. Now, I ask, do not these testimonies give Christ the supreme position in the church? Now turn to Romans. My opponent seems to think that sin cannot exist but by virtue of the violation of the ten commandments. All unbelief is sin, (*John 16:9*,) being a violation of the law of faith. *Romans 3:27*. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. *Romans 14:23*. Is it not sin to violate the law of Christ—of faith—“the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus”—the commandments to believe the Gospel, to repent, to be baptised, to pray, etc.? But he has at last admitted that there are three laws. I wonder if he won’t next admit that it is sin to violate each of them? But has he proved the ten commandments to be one of these three laws? Until he does this, Paul’s letter to Romans will be of no use to his cause. But since my opponent is so fond of reading in the ten commandments, I will accommodate him. Now, if Paul is speaking of the ten commandments when he refers to the law, it will not change his meaning to read in ten commandments instead of law. Try *chapter 3:21, 22*: “But now the righteousness of God *without the ten commandments* is manifested,” etc. In this quotation, “the law” is neither the standard of righteous nor justification, but faith in Jesus Christ. But we are “no law folks.” Let us see. Where is boasting then? (My opponent would answer by the *law* of the ten commandments.) It is excluded. By what *law*? of *work*? Nay; but by the *law* of *faith*. Therefore, we conclude that a man is *justified* by faith, without the deeds (*i.e.* doing) (the ten commandments) of the law. Their faith supersedes the law. Paul evidently refers to the same law. *Chap. 8:2*. “For the *law* of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me *free* from the *law* (*i.e.*, ten commandments) of sin and death.” Also, *Galatians 6:2*: “Bear ye one another’s burdens

and so fulfil the *law* of Christ." Hence we are not dependent upon the ten commandments for a law, notwithstanding we have in the law of Christ nine of them and the two first and great precepts which no man can keep and wrong God or his neighbor. We have other moral precepts also far superior to anything contained in the ten commandments. Here is one which I would cite you. Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets." *Matthew 7:12*. Not a single duty, or moral principle, growing out of our relations to our fellow man, in the law or prophets, in which this great unit precept does not make known our whole duty. But my opponent's appeal to Romans can avail his sinking cause nothing. By reference to *Romans 7:2, 3*, it will be seen that the husband is the lawgiver, and that with him his (the law of which Paul speaks) dies. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. * * * But if the husband be dead, she is free from that (*i.e.*, the law of her husband) law." Moses, the first husband, had legally died, as the head of the Jewish Church, (*Hebrews 3:2*,) and with him had died the obligation of his law, so that the church was no adulteress, though it had married Him who was raised from the dead. *Verse 4th*. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead"—that is, Christ. That Christ superseded Moses, and is the husband, head and lawgiver for the Church, his bride, will be seen by reference to *Ephesians 1:21, 22*, *v. 22, 23, 32*: "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come: and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the head overall things to the church." "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Savior of the body. This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church." That the law of which Paul speaks in Romans died, will be seen by reference to *7:6*: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."*PSDS 85.1*

TWENTY-THIRD SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—The point under discussion last evening, in the course of our investigation of the proposition just read, was based upon *2 Corinthians 3*. I was much surprised at the remarks made by my opponent regarding my failure on this chapter. He said I failed to notice all he wished me to notice; but I had barely made a commencement, and to boast of triumphs under such circumstances was certainly somewhat out of place, to say the least. During the discussion, it has been intimated by my opponent, at least by implication, that I have been excessively embarrassed. Now, I have never expressed the idea that my opponent was embarrassed, at any time. I think perhaps he never was, in his life.*PSDS 87.1*

I am farther astonished that my opponent has taken it for granted that I admit sin to be not merely a transgression of the ten commandments, but the transgression also of the law of the carnal propensities. Did I say anything to that effect? Walking contrary to their natural propensities is not sin. Is it sin to keep the law of God as well as to break the law of God? Is there an individual present, aside from my present opponent, who drew such an inference from anything I have said in this discussion? I must say I hope not.*PSDS 88.1*

About *Romans 7*. He has taken what I said at another time and place, and I might expose what he has said to others; but I do not consider it at all relevant to our present discussion. The law there referred to was not the law that bound the woman to her husband, but the law that gave the husband power over the wife. Now, by what law will she be judged? By the law of her husband? She is proved an adulteress, if her husband did not permit her to have two husbands; but it is by the law that binds the husband to the wife, and *not* by the husband's law.*PSDS 88.2*

My opponent has sometimes designated my remarks as rambling; and if I were obliged to follow him, they would be rambling indeed.*PSDS 88.3*

I acknowledge that we do receive justification wholly through Christ,

but not because we have the contrast of what was written on the tables of stone in our hearts. My opponent says the contrast was between the things written, but it is truly impossible to imprint even nine-tenths of the ten commandments upon a man's heart and yet get the contrast of them upon his heart at the same time. The contrast of "Thou shalt not kill" is not written on the heart of the Christian, for then he would be a murderer. No such contrasts are made in the Christian dispensation. Let my opponent prove that the contrast of these ten commandments that were written upon tables of stone is written upon the fleshly tables of the Christian's heart. Any one can see what that contrast would be, and I do not believe that the contrast of this law is written upon the heart of any human being by the hand of God.*PSDS 88.4*

2 Corinthians 3:2, 3, etc. He will compare this with other scripture. Moses was the minister of God's law, and it was subsequently carried out by the Levitical priests. Moses began this ministration when he brought the ten commandments down from Mount Sinai. Now, I ask, was it not the glory of Moses' countenance that was veiled? I say that the ten commandments were not veiled, and that the glory of his face did not represent what he held in his hand. Was not their service based upon the law? Certainly; that law was the basis of their ministration. The glory of Moses' face here represents that ministration, and the contrast is placed between Moses and the Apostles. *12th and 13th verses*. They are declared in the Scriptures to be shadows of things to come. *17th verse*. Now, we will look in reference to the term used in the *7th verse*, "ministration of death." Now, it is claimed that the law written or graven on stones is comprehended in the ministration of death. I contend that the word "ministration" has reference to Moses and those who served or ministered in reference to that law. In this case it is precisely the same as with any one who administers law of any kind. The ministration may change, as in the case of our government, once in four years; but that does not change the law that is to be administered. We have a change of administration every four years, but our law or Constitution, on which that administration is based, remains unchanged.*PSDS 88.5*

Whatever may be said about our going here and there in our arguments, we only reply that the very Scriptures themselves are

written here a little and there a little; and I will not be Jewed out of any Scripture I may chance to bring up for your consideration. *Proverbs 3:21, 22*, etc.; also *Proverbs 4:20-22, 22*; also *Deuteronomy 32:46, 47*. Now, what was their life? It was to keep the law of God. It was therefore their death to break that law. This last we will show from the Scripture: *2 Corinthians 3*; *Deuteronomy 20:19*. "—for the tree is the field of man's life,—"In what sense? Only in the sense of that which will sustain life. One more: *2 Kings 4:40*. The effect is taken for the cause in every case. *Romans 7:10*, etc. Here the law is shown to be both life and death to us. *Verse 9th*. "When the commandment came, sin revived and I died."*PSDS 89.1*

He could occupy the two relations to it. Here the effect is taken for the cause in every instance.*PSDS 89.2*

And now, beloved friends, I am willing to rest it with you all, whether the difference between the law, and the ministration of the law is not a clear point. Moses was the minister, and the ministration that he commenced was carried out by the Levitical priesthood. *Jeremiah 31:31, 32, 33*. This is not the language of similitude, for it is plain and unequivocal. All the old ordinances were representations of things future. They were shadows of something to come in every case, but God's law has never been changed—only the ministration. Jesus makes an actual atonement for sin, but in the old dispensation there were only types of that atonement. The old dispensation only wrote the law of God upon tables of tone, but the new puts it into the heart of man.*PSDS 89.3*

TWENTY-FOURTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—Well my friends, it seems that I am fairly on the affirmative side of the question, and, therefore, I must lead. My opponent certainly cannot say that I will neither follow no lead, for I do just as I am compelled to by his course of argument. Now I am at least two speeches behind him. I told him that I should wait till he took a position upon Rom. and Gal. I did wait at least two speeches, and then went back to prove that there was but one law; and also to define the covenant more fully than it had been before done. *Matthew 5*, and *Matthew 22*, that he had quoted and I had not noticed. I then led out upon the subject of the abolition of the Old Testament law, and proved that the Sinaitic covenant the ten commandments, had been done away. Under that law the children of the bond woman could not be joint heirs with the children of the free woman. I showed that the book of the covenant, as it was in the original, was ready to vanish away; and also proved that the law of the old dispensation—the ten commandments of course, included—had died. This was an unnatural position, and I freely acknowledge it, but I was driven to take the course I did, because he would not lead out, as it was his duty to do, and take a position on Rom. and Gal. Last evening, I noticed *Romans 3:31*, showing that the Old Testament law, though it may not have been done away by faith in Christ, yet it may have been done away, as we believe it has, by limitation.*PSDS 90.1*

My opponent would prove the perpetuity of the fourth commandment by Romans; but instead of going forward he takes his position in the back ground, and has been following me ever since. Of course, I cannot compel him to take his proper position in this debate, and for the sake of making some progress in the discussion, I am willing to lead. And, seeing he is very willing, and apparently anxious to follow, I will agree to occupy the position of an affirmative.*PSDS 91.1*

And here allow me to remark, in answer to some insinuations that have been made, that everything I say, I say "*for effect*;" and if my worthy friend who is trying to oppose me in this discussion, is not talking "for effect" also, he had better stop. I am now speaking for effect. That is it exactly. I am speaking to affect your minds by what

I consider to be the truth. But I said what I did because he had referred to the same matter some fifteen or twenty times, and we have to go over and over this, I shall probably be under the necessity of speaking just to fill up time. If I were properly in the affirmative, and did not furnish him with matter to reply to, I would not blame him at all for speaking just to occupy time*PSDS 91.2*

I never accused him of saying that he would endorse the language I quoted from Romans; but I should suppose that he would do so. I have never even accused him of endorsing any of the language of Paul. I merely said that I supposed he would admit there was another law, than the ten commandments, that it would be a sin to transgress.*PSDS 91.3*

Now, about, *2 Corinthians 3*, he says, there cannot be a contrast between or in regard to anything but the ministration. I do not deny that the places in which the two were written were contrasted. But what was written was, also, contrasted. Now, to show that some of the principles of the ten commandments are written in the heart of the christian, and to show that the whole ten have been perpetuated as a binding law, are two very different things. I will give the contrast that Jesus himself gives in *Matthew 5:21*, etc. Let me give you another case. The commandment as quoted here, says: “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” but Christ, says: “That whosoever looketh on a woman,” etc. Here is a contrast too plain to be overlooked. “When there is no law, there is no transgression,” and these ten commandments do not require us to love our neighbor at all, any more than if they were written in the statute book of Wisconsin. Was Christ’s teaching binding, centuries before He lived —is not this the most illogical method of reasoning in the world? must we reason thus? A man need not take lessons even from so humble a logician as J. M. Stephenson to be able to show the fallacy of such argument.*PSDS 91.4*

I will just notice a mistake my opponent made, and it looks to me as though it was rather a fatal mistake, too, or at least an anti Bible one. He stated that Moses’ countenance did not symbolize the ten commandments. Am I correct in quoting his language? I do not wish to misrepresent at all. Now, I will show you that his face shone with such brilliancy that the people could not look upon it when he came

down with the tables containing the ten commandments: *Exodus 34:24*. If it was any law it was the ten commandments. But if any man will show that they are called a law, I will call them so and not otherwise. *Exodus 34:27, and 29*. The ten commandments were in his hand and nothing more. Only two tables of the testimony in his hand. And now when he came down, the skin of his face shone with a glory that shadowed forth the ten commandments. Here is the Bible in the case. Here is the Bible in regard to what he had in his hand. Was it the ten commandments he had in his hand, or was it some other commandments? He says that death and life are used figuratively—that the effect is put for the cause in every instance he has quoted. He says it is not death that is written in the tables of stone, but he gains nothing as far as this text is concerned, by such an argument. Look at his text in Romans, by which he proves that the law of which Paul treats was the ten commandments. When a thing is plainly stated, it may not be gainsaid, VIII, 2nd. Once I was troubled to harmonize this with grammar. I happened to find Bro. Andrews' work, and it threw some new light upon this point. The law of death and life are two different things. The wife of a man, and the man whose wife she is, are two different things. But now mark, he failed to show that the law is called death, or that the ten commandments were called a law. *2 Corinthians 3*. I wish to call your attention to one of our rules, that the Bible, according to its most obvious import, is to be the only evidence in this investigation. The Bible is not Webster. Now what was written on stones? —*death*? or the *ministration* of death? Bring all the philologists and grammarians in the world, and they would all tell you that the obvious meaning is that the *ministration* was written on stones. Shall we get up another [original illegible] Just hear the reading and judge for yourselves, what is the obvious import of this language. What is written? Death? or the ministration? The latter is written on stones according to the most obvious import of the language used. It does seem that some men have *uncommon* sense. The 9th Verse, he did not notice. He certainly had time this time. He had a *great deal* of time and why did he not notice this verse? And seeing I have expended so much upon this 9th verse, I would be glad to have him notice it.*PSDS 92.1*

Let us try and find what was contrasted by this same author. "For if the *ministration* of condemnation belongs, much more doth the

ministration of righteousness," etc. Now, let me read it as he reads the 7th verse—explain the place in which this ministration was written, and all is plain. Now I submit the obvious import of the language, to this intelligent audience. You will carry these testimonies home to your judgments after this discussion ceases, and I wish you to consider the subject fairly, and decide between me and my opponent. What is glorious? Not condemnation, but the *ministration* of condemnation. Not righteousness but the *ministration* of righteousness. It does seem to me that even a *child* could not fail to understand such plain language as this. Will my opponent tell what the adjective *that*, in the 11th verse, refers to? What was glorious? "The *ministration* written and engraven on stones." What was done away? Why, according to the plain obvious import of language, it was the *ministration* of death *as* written and engraven on stones, that was done away. There is no noun, except that of *ministration*, to point out by the demonstrative adjective that, in *verses 10th, 11th, and 13th*. Compare with *verse 9th*. I will submit this to any grammarian present. It was the ministration that was written upon stones, and it was the ministration that was done away. Neither Webster nor the figurative use of the term death, will change or figure away the force of this language or argument. "Seeing then that we have such hope, we use *great plainness of speech*."*PSDS 93.1*

TWENTY-FIFTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I do not know that it is necessary on my part, when I have shown a false issue, for me to follow in every point of the conclusion deduced from it, but, in the present instance, as my opponent charges me with overlooking the most important part of his argument, I will notice the 9th verse. [Reads.] Now, says he, what is glorious? He replies, the ministration of condemnation. Well, then, of course, the condemnation and the ministration of condemnation are not identical. Hence, there is a distinction to be made between death and the ministration of death. Here is expressly the distinction that I have claimed, and he has brought it out a little clearer than I did—that's all.*PSDS 93.2*

Now, to proceed farther, in reference to the new covenant—*1 Chronicles 16:15, 16*, etc. My opponent often refers to his being troubled by not having his Scripture before him, and at a certain point of his remarks last night, he said Eld. Hall had difficulty relative to *2 Corinthians 3:7*. Eld. Hall, as well as himself, had told me that he considered it settled beyond dispute. Now, he must have spoken positively, and he may be in doubt about some of the positions he now takes. But to go back to the text. The covenant here spoken [original illegible] was the ten commandments. He has shown that, and I will not, of course, attempt to disprove it. He says, I have admitted that the covenant made at Horeb or Sinai is the ten commandments, but I deny that I have admitted it, and shall deny it so long as I see good reason to do so.*PSDS 94.1*

My opponent makes a distinction between a law-giver and a law-maker. We claim the sole distinction is between making a law and conforming to the provisions of that law. Now, what need to go away to dictionaries, in order to know the Scriptures? etc. We think dictionaries are very important to the proper understanding of any language. From the readings of this Scripture, are we to conclude that the ten commandments are the covenant of God? Well, then, how could the children of Israel break these commandments? No man can break the covenant, or promise of God. God alone can break the covenant of God. I claim a distinction between a covenant and the condition of a covenant. He refers to *Genesis 26:1-5*. I have put no words in the mouth of the Lord, but I have gone to the

Scripture in every instance. He considers that he has proved a parallel between the ten commandments and God's covenant. It is true that the promise regarding the land was given, or repeated at the same time of the giving of the ten commandments, but they are by no means one and the same thing. But he pleads a parallel between *Genesis 26*. and *1 Chronicles 16:15 and 18*. In the one case we have not only the promise given to Abram, but the reason, which is because of his obedience to God's law. We have in both the promise and the commandments. My opponent goes on to show that the ten commandments are a covenant. I challenge him to show that there is another covenant commanded beside the one given at Sinai. This is the very covenant upon which the promise recorded in the context is based. But we will see if this is not the only commanded covenant in the Scriptures. He proved that the ten commandments were a covenant and that they were done away, and why didn't I give right up? Simply because I don't yield quite so easy. *2 Kings 23:3*. Thus we see that there was a covenant that they had agreed to keep, and their agreeing to keep it was a covenant also. What is the definition of the word covenant? I must go to Webster, as he is acknowledged to be the best of all our authorities, in such matters. The first definition he gives, is a mutual agreement between two parties. Now, their agreement, and their promise to keep that agreement, were two different things—*Exodus 19:3 and 6*. The Lord here expresses a condition. Here is a promise on the part of the Lord, and a promise on the part of the people. That same condition is given as many as three times afterwards. Then, of course, the covenant was one thing, and the mutual agreement to keep that covenant was another thing. It was the covenant that demanded obedience. What covenant is it that demands obedience? Why, the ten commandments. Had they heard His voice? No; for His covenant was declared unto them by Moses. They did not see God.*PSDS 94.2*

I want to remark right here, that holiness of character depends upon obedience to God. Here was a law, it has been argued, that did not reach the heart. But obedience to God was recognized here, and how could a man love God well enough to obey Him without having his heart made better? If they transgressed that law, what? They were stoned to-death. But if by any means that penalty was avoided, how could he be punished except at the final judgment?

To assume that a man could keep the ten commandments and only have temporal blessings conferred upon him, is an assumption unworthy of a professed Christian.*PSDS 95.1*

However, I am only under obligations to deny that assumption, not to prove its fallacy by argument. “All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.” No one can deny that the mutual agreement was not made upon mutual conditions. They were promising to keep their covenant with God, and in return He was to call them His peculiar people. I do not think the law of Christ Jesus will place us in a better position than that.*PSDS 96.1*

But I want to examine one position, viz: That this is the very covenant that Moses made at Horeb. Was it the ten commandments? If we can show that God made a covenant at Horeb, and then made a covenant of the ten commandments or that that covenant was based upon the ten commandments, it will not prove that the ten commandments were of themselves a covenant. Now, what was the covenant made at Horeb? You say it was the ten commandments. But were they made at Horeb? Some of these precepts were binding before they were given at Mount Horeb. I want to know if sin was not recognized with reference to disobedience of the fourth commandment, before the ten commandments were given at Mount Sinai. The children of Israel had not got to Horeb, when that obligation was made known to them. When we bring the most positive evidence to this, for he went right back to the wilderness of sin, to prove that the obligation did not begin at Horeb. You will begin to allow that the obligation to observe the fourth commandment existed at the time of Abraham. *1 Chronicles 16*. If at any time we have felt embarrassed by any of his sarcasms, it was certainly not when he accused us of thinking more of—. The contrast that we have got cannot be broken down, except by fair argument. We have intended from the beginning to rest this discussion upon plain, unequivocal, Scriptural facts. I believe my brethren will not boast of my having defended what we believe to be the truth by anything except the plain word of God. We can only trust the result with the God of truth. That God hath declared that His commandments shall stand forever and ever. Abram understood the obligation imposed in *every one* of the ten commandments. The subject of the fourth commandment is

revealed to man, before any of the rest. But we are asked, why was not this commandment recorded before? Moses did not write this history for the guidance of those of whom he wrote in this history. If a history of the United States should be written, you would not expect all the laws of the U. S. in it; and when we come to Moses, he was writing for the times in which he lived—for those of his own age. We have shown by implication, the pre-existence of these precepts. It is in *Genesis 2*. The Sabbath there recorded is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and no quibble on the land or earth will avail anything. What is the definition of sanctify? It is to set apart for a particular use. We do not understand that because God rested on the seventh day, therefore He, in creating other worlds, must rest on the seventh day. We understand that the seventh day was set apart for want, use and observance. Supposing we bring in seven articles for a friend to use, but one of them is to be set apart for a particular purpose. The only way is to tell that person of the use you wish him to put that particular article to. Thus it has been with God. He gives us seven days in each week, and they are for our use, but He says the seventh day shall be used only for a particular purpose.*PSDS 96.2*

TWENTY-SIXTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—In relation to *2 Corinthians 3:7*. Whenever I make a mistake, I am willing to acknowledge it. But I have no recollection of making any acknowledgement, with Bro. Hall, that the question with reference to this passage was settled. If Bro. Hall cannot recollect it, I must think Eld. Waggoner's statement a misrepresentation.*PSDS 97.1*

I want to call your attention to some things that my opponent challenged me to prove. He calls upon me to show where a covenant is commanded except the ten commandments. But the text does not require me to do it. "*The word* which He commanded to a thousand generations; even of the covenant which He made with Abraham, and of His oath unto Isaac, * * Saying, unto thee will i give the land of Canaan," etc. He, the Lord, tells in the most explicit language, what *covenant*, what *word*, He commanded to a thousand generations. *Genesis 15:18*. God commanded His word to a thousand generations. He says I had no use to refer to *Genesis 15:18*; *26:3*. I merely referred to them to show the analogy between them and the *covenant, word* and *oath* of God to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as used interchangeably in *1 Chronicles 16*. Here is a covenant *commanded*, and confirmed by the oath of God. But the phrase law is in it. One single commandment to Adam was a law, and I challenge him to show that Adam had the ten commandments. If *law* means *ten commandments*, what do *laws* mean?*PSDS 97.2*

As for my opponent, *he* is entirely innocent of the charge of using sarcasm. Your speaker has not used any sarcasm. "But who art thou, that condemnest another, whereas, thou doest the same thing?"*PSDS 98.1*

"Be ye mindful, always, of His covenant." Covenant and word are used interchangeably. As for myself, I shall stand or fall by the Bible. He says, a promise of God cannot be kept except by God. Is there a commandment here to be kept? Does it say *keep* his covenant? It says, "be *ye mindful* of," etc.*PSDS 98.2*

If a man cannot keep the promise of God, he can, at least, keep the

condition that secures the *fulfillment* of that promise. How can the law of faith be kept? Ans: Only by continuing to believe. Just so in reference to the promise of God. Faith is founded upon the word of God. The Bible is to be the only evidence in this discussion. I will not bandy words here again, on this point; the language of God is too plain to admit of two sides. He has assumed the position of a respondent in the New Testament, and I am determined to go ahead. Now, if I speak and then tell the people what I say, no one has a right to say that I said something else. And here is a case in point. Must we go to Genesis to find out what God said? Even the covenant which he made unto Abram, etc. But we want to know what the Lord said. If He tells us that he commanded His covenant to a thousand generations, criticism shall fall like Dragon before the Ark of God.*PSDS 98.3*

In regard to the covenant made at Horeb. What is the obvious import of the Bible language in regard to this? What did God say? When I showed that the Sinaitic covenant has been done away, did my opponent acknowledge it? By no means. Moreover, I never knew a man to acknowledge his error in a public discussion, and I never knew a man to yield a single point even, and do not expect that my opponent will do so. He takes his position, and no argument will make him acknowledge that that position is not right.*PSDS 98.4*

But mark his definition of covenant. “I believe I can show three covenants in the Bible—a covenant of law, a covenant of promise and a covenant of agreement.” The ten commandments are a covenant; therefore they are a covenant of law. But listen a little farther. It is a covenant of *law* and it is a covenant of *agreement* also Read *Exodus 19:3, 4*, etc. In other words, the ten commandments are the covenant, and the conditions of the covenant also. If this is not mixing up things greatly, I cannot see. My opponent seems to overlook the fact that the Bible is to be the only evidence in the case. He seems to think that *his* reasoning is to be received, and that mine, whether based upon the Bible or not, is to be neglected entirely. But I will here say that it is *the truth* we wish to bring out, in this discussion, not the theory of either disputant. It is the Bible that we wish to investigate, and the great question for us to ask ourselves, and each other, is, what saith the Scriptures? If awful consequences are to grow out of reading the

Bible, separate from Webster's Dictionary, I don't know as I am to blame in the matter—it's author must be the one. *Deuteronomy 4:12*. What was that covenant? Ans: The ten commandments. What was the covenant He declares He did not make with the fathers? *Deuteronomy 5:1 to 4*. Ans: the ten commandments. "The Lord our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. The Lord made not this covenant with our father, but with us, even us who are all of us here alone this day." I don't care a cent about Webster, my opponent cannot drag him in here, in opposition to the Bible. Now, read *5:22*. "And the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; and He added no more: and He wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." Here is the covenant that God made with them at Horeb, and did not make with their fathers. My opponent further accuses me of a willingness to admit the pre-existence of *nine* of the commandments if I can only overthrow the fourth. But I never have admitted that he proved the pre-existence of all, or *any one* of them. I merely reasoned from his position or assumption. I will endorse no such thing. When my opponent brings plain Bible testimony, in support of his assumptions, then I will admit their truthfulness, and not till then. If this is bringing him in a critical position before this people, I can only say I can't help it. God Himself tells us just what He said, and we do not need Webster to explain what God says. Let my opponent settle with God's word as recorded by Moses, instead of with what Webster says.*PSDS 98.5*

Now, about *2 Corinthians 3*, He says: What is death, but condemnation? Condemnation is a sentence, and death is a penalty or the execution of that sentence. Does not time always elapse between the sentence of condemnation and execution? But he has not made a point here. The contrast is between the two ministrations: Is my criticism just, or is it not? Is it the ministration of condemnation that is glorious, or is it the condemnation? To answer these questions, you have only to take the obvious import of the language used. "The ministration glorious—the condemnation glorious." *Verse 9*. Choose that which is the most reasonable.*PSDS 100.1*

But suppose he could find the word death used for the law in any case: he has gained nothing even then. I have proved to you that it

is the ministration that was done away. You may call this dogmatism, and say that I have a positive temperament. So has my opponent. The ministration of condemnation was glorious, but the ministration of righteousness excelled in glory. If the ministration of condemnation which was done away was glorious, how much more glorious is the ministration of righteousness that remaineth. “The ministration of (condemnation) death was written and graven in stones,” and it was that ministration that “was done away.” I would say to my friends on my left hand, I leave this to your own good sense and discrimination, whether my criticism on this scripture is not correct—whether this is not the most obvious import of the language used by Paul. As for my friends on my right hand, I leave them to take care of themselves!*PSDS 100.2*

Now, my respected friends, I can prove the existence of two gods on the same principle that my opponent proves that there are two laws. Let us look at this. God is represented as being a God of love. He is also represented as being a God of anger. The same God cannot possess two opposite natures that would be continually at war with and tending to destroy each other. But I will also take his own arguments and show that the same law may have two attributes apparently opposite—that is, spiritually and carnally. *Matthew 5:18*: “For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” Or, as Campbell renders it, “One iota or tittle shall not perish without attaining its end.” *Romans 10:4*: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” Now, I believe all this. Christ did not come to destroy the law, and yet at the same time might not this old code of laws, (the ten commandments included,) that was given merely to restrain the overt actions of the children of Israel, be done away? Because Christ did not come to abolish it, does not prove that it never is to be abolished. I do not consider the conclusion of my opponent a necessary one. He does not prove that the ten commandments are a law at all. In the absence of plain Bible testimony, let us reason according to the plain common acceptation of language. But the Bible, according to its most obvious import, is to be the only evidence in this discussion, according to the regulations we mutually agreed to before it commenced. *Romans 7*. Two attributes no more prove two laws than two Gods.*PSDS 100.3*

AFTERNOON OF THE LAST DAY

[Mr. Stephenson remarked that a mutual agreement had been made between the principals in the discussion, by which it was arranged that it should close with two more speeches each. Elder Waggoner to have an additional half hour for his closing argument. He, however, reserved the privilege of replying to any new argument or position that Eld. W. might advance or take in his last speech.*PSDS 101.1*

Mr. Waggoner remarked that his friends need not be surprised if he was a little embarrassed. He had not anticipated that the discussion was to close so soon. Of course neither he nor Elder Stephenson expected to bring before the people *all* the Bible testimony that could be brought, in the time that could be devoted to this discussion. He stated to the congregation that he came there in ill health, and he did not think it was required of him to extend his labors in this discussion beyond two more speeches. He did think he could maintain sufficient clearness or strength of mind to continue the debate longer, and as the friends of the negative seemed quite anxious, from some cause, to close the discussion, (he believed they were expecting a meeting of another sort soon,) he was willing to accommodate; hence, he would rather close it up, as had been stated by Elder Stephenson, within this afternoon.—Reporter.]*PSDS 101.2*

TWENTY-SEVENTH SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I was speaking, this morning, of the covenant of God spoken in the ten commandments, showing that the obligation of man to observe them was not for the first time revealed or made known at Horeb. All that we can ascertain in reference to these laws is by implication. We infer that the law was recognized, from the fact that the principles of the ten commandments were recognized, and that the transgression of those principles was recognized and punished before the ten commandments were given at Mount Sinai, through Moses, to the children of Israel. In regard to the fourth commandment, we have seen that the obligation to observe it was imposed before it was given at Horeb. God sanctified the seventh day when He rested on it from the work of creation. To sanctify means to set apart for an especial purpose or use. The seventh day was not to be used by man as the other six days were, else it would not have been set apart or hallowed by the Almighty. Suppose I bring several articles for the use of a particular person or friend. One of them could not be set apart for a particular use without enjoining upon the person to whom it is given that it is so set apart. Thus the seventh day would not have been sanctified by God if it had not been set apart when it was given by Him to man. We find also that this covenant was subsequently set apart by God for a thousand generations. I shall not quote Scripture now to prove this, as it will only consume time.*PSDS 102.1*

Again, in regard to the assumption put forth by my opponent, that the ten commandments are not a law. They are a covenant complete, and my opponent has over and over admitted it by saying that there was nothing in the ten commandments except certain conditions, the keeping or observing of which was to be rewarded by a possession of the land of Canaan. Now, I wish to call your attention, to *Hebrews 8*., as quoted from *Jeremiah 31*. *Verses 7-10*. Now, we would inquire if it is not evident, from what we have shown, that the ten commandments are the conditions of both agreements? The firs covenant was an agreement, and the second was likewise an agreement, and both were based upon the same condition—the keeping of the ten commandments. Now, are the laws that God puts in the hearts of the people the same as the ten

commandments and nothing else? The ten commandments, therefore, gendered to bondage. We think our opponent has more special pleadings on the ten comments than we have.*PSDS 102.2*

He quotes *2 Corinthians 3*, to show that the ten commandments have been abolished or done away. He has claimed that there was a law abolished, and we have shown what that law was—that it was the law of ordinances. But he will not admit that anything else was abolished except the ten commandments. I'm sure I cannot help thinking my opponent's conclusions are erroneous.*PSDS 103.1*

But there is something else to be noticed in Hebrews. I wish to notice the difference between the promises of the first and second covenants. *Exodus 19*. Moses stood between the people and the Lord. He took the word of the Lord to the people, and then took the word of the people to the Lord. He was, therefore, minister between the people and the Lord.*PSDS 103.2*

If the people broke a single covenant or condition of the covenant, God could not fulfill His promise to them. If they broke that law, He could not consider them His peculiar people at all. The heathen had done the abominations He prohibited, and He drove them out. This law was given to the children of Israel that they might develop holy characters. Now look at *Hebrews 8:9*. They did not keep the covenant of the ten commandments, therefore, the ten commandments must pass away. Some infer this, but I wish to inquire whether any one of the ten commandments is invalidated because the people broke it? If I make an agreement with another man, and he does not keep his part of the agreement, then it is, of course, invalidated; but with the covenant of the ten commandments, it is different; they, being given by the authority of God, were not invalidated because they were not obeyed by the people. There was no blood offered by that covenant that could take away sin; therefore, the law is not made void by faith. By faith the individual is brought into obedience or subjection to God's law. There was no forgiveness brought by the ministration of the old covenant, but by the ministration of this new covenant we have forgiveness and the remission of sin. Hence, there are better promises given in this covenant than in the old, but the *condition* of these promises remains the same—obedience to the law of

God.*PSDS 103.3*

But it is argued that if obedience to this first covenant only brought temporal blessings, disobedience would only bring temporal punishment, and *vice versa*. Now if the transgression of the conditions of the first covenant only brought temporal punishment, why did persons mediate? This is a nail fastened in a sure place that cannot be removed.*PSDS 104.1*

Chron. and Gen. He intimates that I need not go away back to Gen. again, but I want to do so—I don't know how he can prevent it. I am perfectly willing to have him refer to as many passages, or to the same passage as many times as he may see fit, and he must give me the same privilege. I think, however, that the 26th chapter is the best parallel. In *Psalm 60*, it is just as distinctly stated, that the law of God shall be fulfilled in the meditation, as in the hearts of those who are to be the subjects of that meditation. Contrast does not mean a comparison. Webster does not give that as any definition whatever, of the word contrast. "I will put my law in," etc. I say, if they understood what the Lord was speaking about—it was that He would take His law and put it into the hearts of the people, and by His law He meant the ten commandments. Not a law in contrast with this which was written on stones, but the same law. What would a law in opposition, or contrast to the ten commandments be? I, for one, do not want any law in contrast with the ten commandments put into *my* heart. Can any one wish it? I really hope not. Can any one show that the contrast or opposite of the ten commandments, are put into the hearts of God's people, by the New Testament? I wish I had the time to pursue this position taken by my opponent, farther, and examine it in all its parts, but I have not. But I would ask every individual here, to decide the question fairly, whether it is the teaching of the Bible that the law of Jesus Christ puts the *contrast of the ten commandments into the heart of any man—into the heart of the christian*.*PSDS 104.2*

Galatians 5:19, etc. The exact application that I was going to make of this, has slipped my mind. But we could not suppose that the *contrast* of the ten commandments is put into the hearts of the people of God, either under the old or new dispensation. Christ is meditating, not only for those who have transgressed this covenant,

but the first covenant also, for transgressions under both covenants are identical in their nature. The very individuals who had their sins taken away *in type* by the sacrifice of bulls and goats, have their sins taken away *in fact* in this dispensation. This is making a separation of God's law into distinct parts that I cannot allow or assent to at all.*PSDS 104.3*

TWENTY-EIGHTH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Negative.—How much labor a little discrimination would save? How very easy it is to overlook the very point that should be considered; the principal one to give any light on the subject. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." "Sin is the transgression of the law." And I have called upon my opponent again and again, to show that the ten commandments are called a law, anywhere between the two lids of the Bible, and he has not done it. His system of argument is a system of analysis and induction, and, I might add, assumption. There's the blood of the covenant, and the book of the covenant, and the book of the law. The very law referred, to, in Gal. is the book of the law. The book of the law contained all the laws given to restrain other actions of the children of Israel—the two were written in the book.*PSDS 105.1*

In reference to the covenant, I will notice a great many points, or at least, I hope to be able to notice them in my summing up speech. I can show that the same promises were made, and the same blessings conferred for obedience to all the commandments given by God to the children of Israel. My friends of Crane's Grove, read for yourselves. Remember my positions are unshaken. I have not yielded, I do not yield a single inch of ground, till convinced by plain Bible testimony. I will hang on to this subject till next spring—till grass grows and flowers bloom—before I will have it said that I gave up, or wished to have the discussion closed. I never made the proposition to have this discussion close with to-day. This is the position I will take, I *will not* close the discussion this afternoon, without an explanation of my friend's remark that we wished the discussion to stop for our meeting or for anything else.*PSDS 105.2*

"Nothing but the ten commandments abolished." By reference to *Colossians 2:11 to 16*, we find something more abolished. I will stand by the position that the ten commandments are a covenant. In regard to Webster, I know nothing of the definition of contrast, but I am sure the best speakers and writers use it in the sense of comparison; and even if they *did not* so use it, I have the right of defining it myself, in the sense I wished to be understood. I care nothing for Webster or any one else, in this instance. But to our passage, *Colossians 2:14, 15*, etc. Here we have the hand writing

of ordinances done away. Now, let us read, carefully, *Colossians 2:14, 16, 17*, and see whether we do not think something more than the ten commandments were abolished. "Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, that was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross. Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the *Sabbath days*, which are a shadow of things to come, but the *body* is of *Christ*." Here the Sabbaths without limitation are represented as sharing the fate of all the other feast days, and Jewish ordinances, viz: "Nailed to the cross and taken out of the way." This letter was addressed to a church composed of Jew and Gentile. In the absence of one precept to observe any Sabbath, or one reproof for Sabbath breaking, what would the Gentiles, who had not been taught the observance of a weekly Sabbath, any more than the annual Sabbaths, or any of the Jewish feasts think of such language? What would we think under similar circumstances? We would, and could not otherwise, think that *all* the Sabbaths had been nailed to the cross; and that, therefore, no man had a right to judge us for their non-observance. But it is urged by my opponent that these are *past day* Sabbaths. Admitted. But the seventh day was a feast day just as much as any of the other Sabbaths. This my opponent has denied, but the Bible must decide where doctors disagree. All who have Bibles, turn with me to *Leviticus 23:2-5*, and let us hear what the Lord says in reference to this matter.*PSDS 105.3*

"Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them concerning the *feasts of the Lord*, which ye shall proclaim to be *holy convocations*, even these are my feasts. Six days shall work be done, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no work therein: it is the Sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings. *These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons*. In the fourteenth day of the first month, at even, is the Lord's passover." Also, *verses 6th and 7th*, "And on the fifteenth day * * is the feast of unleavened bread, etc. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: *ye shall do no servile work therein*." Also, *verses 13, 14, 21, 24, 32, 37, 29, 30*. Here they are all called *Sabbaths, feast days, an holy convocation*, and were *all* to continue *throughout their generations*. *Exodus 31:13, 16*. And by reference to *2 Chronicles*

2:4, we find all these *festival Sabbaths* called the *Sabbaths of the Lord*.*PSDS 106.1*

Any argument, therefore, which would prove that any of the Sabbaths were a shadow, festival or handwriting of ordinance—would prove the same for the seventh day Sabbath. Do away with all the *festival Sabbaths* and the *seventh day Sabbaths* passes away with them. Again I endorse my opponents admission that all the festival Sabbaths perished at the cross. My opponent admits that the gospel is the great *rule* of *justification*. But according to Paul, it is, also the *rule* of righteousness, *Romans 1:16 and 17*. Here the gospel is the *power* and *righteousness* of God. It is all that is necessary to salvation.*PSDS 107.1*

The *law of faith* is the standard of "*righteousness*," "*justification*" and "*salvation*," "without the law." *Chap 3:21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28*. "*Justified* by *faith without the deeds, i.e.* doing, of the *law*." *Verse 21*, of the same chapter, is quoted by my opponent to show that the whole world is amenable to the ten commandments. But it remains to be proved that Paul is speaking of the ten commandments, much less that he means all who has never heard of the law, as well as those who have. The original will apply to any nation or people as well as to all nations and peoples. The entire context limits this term to the Jews and Greeks; the one having the *written* code, and the other having the *same law* written in their hearts—memories. *Chap 2:15*. The Jews spoke the Greek language, and were dispersed all over Greece.*PSDS 107.2*

The Greeks were as familiar with the law of the Jews as the Canadians are with the laws of these United States. But there is another class who *sin* and *perish without law*, *verse 12*. Why should the apostle say "*where there is no law, there is no transgression*," if there were none but what had law? *Romans 3:31*, once more. I would ask, does the fact of the law being confined prove its perpetuity beyond the time of its confirmation, any more than the confirmation of the prophesies prove their perpetuity? *verse 21*. I have tried to get my opponent to *Romans 7*, again, but he seems to be afraid of that chapter. I will call your attention again to *Hebrews 3:1 to 6*, where Moses is contrasted with Christ. Remember, I use the word contrast in the sense of comparison. Here the Church of

God, over which Moses and Christ presides, the first as a servant, and the second as a son. That this house was a church appears from *verse 6th*. The house is the church. But Moses occupies a lower position than that of Christ.*PSDS 107.3*

Now look at *Romans 7:2 to 4*. It has been shown that Jesus Christ was to be a law-giver. And here let me remark that man ought not to hold the Bible up to ridicule. There should be more respect for the word of God. This passage terminates the life of the law by the death of the first husband, Moses. As long as this husband lived, the woman to be subject to this law, but if the husband be dead, it clears her from that law. After her husband is dead she is declared to be no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Now for the contrast or comparison. *Verses 4, 5, 6, 1st*. The woman—the church, is represented as being married to Christ, her second husband, and thereby released from the law of her first husband. 2nd. She is represented as being released by the death of the law of her first husband, *verse 6th*. Campbell, Whiting and the whole context harmonizes with the textual reading of the 6th verse. Remember that the law and penalty are two entirely different things. Now for the application. *Verses 4, 5, 6*. Here we have two law-givers presented—Moses and Christ. Moses was the first husband and Jesus Christ is the second husband, and the church is the wife. The first husband being dead, of course the wife is released from his law. But our friends here are not willing to have the wife marry the second husband. They wish, first, to place the dead head of Moses upon the living body of Christ. But Jesus Christ occupies a pre-eminent position in the church. He is the head of the church, and to him, and him alone, should the church look for law. [Time up.]*PSDS 108.1*

TWENTY-NINTH SPEECH

[A mutual explanation was made, by which it was agreed to have the discussion close as before arranged, and I did not think it necessary to repeat what was said.—[Reporter.]*PSDS 108.2*

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—I wish to notice a few criticisms that have come up in the course of this discussion, and the first is *Matthew 5:18*. My opponent substituted the word sooner for "till" in his reading of it. I am satisfied that this is an incorrect translation, and in support of my view of the meaning of this passage, I wish to give the criticism of Mr. Wesley. He says: "It was not the design of Christ to abolish His Father's law. He renders the phrase "till all be fulfilled"——"till the consumation of all things—all things in the universe." [Query: Does the word "consummation" mean *consuming* by fire or otherwise?—*Reporter*.] I simply say that my opponent has thrown out the remark that he would leave certain things to any grammarian. Here is Mr. Wesley for one, that is against him, and I would add there are several others on the same side with Wesley, though they may be of humble pretensions.*PSDS 109.1*

Again, my opponent has declared of the "golden rule," that it teaches purer morality than the ten commandments.*PSDS 109.2*

Look at *Matthew 7:12*. "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them:" *for this is better than the law and the prophets*. Does it read so? No, "for this is *the* law and the prophets." Do you look for anything plainer than that?*PSDS 109.3*

Again, in *Matthew 5:28*, it is claimed that the Savior imposes an obligation that is not found in the ten commandments. Now, let us take a Scripture that my opponent has often used. *Matthew 22:23 to 33*. Could he have read that passage in Exodus, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob," and said that it referred to the resurrection? Christ only declared it as evidence of the resurrection.*PSDS 109.4*

A great many deny that it refers to the resurrection, but I think it conclusively proves the resurrection from the dead.*PSDS 109.5*

Again, I wish to notice *2 Corinthians 3:7*. The position my opponent takes on this is nothing new. He stated that condemnation and death art not identical. He made a marked distinction between the two, and I wish to make it also. The same distinction that he recognizes between condemnation and death, I recognize between ministration and death. If the ministration be identical with death, then the ministration is not done away, and if the condemnation be not identical with—, then they are both done away, but I never have found anything of the kind in the Scripture. [I will not vouch for the correctness of this last sentence.—*Reporter*.]*PSDS 109.6*

Again, God never enjoined the observance of but three yearly feasts, and to say that every day on which a holy convocation was enjoined was a feast day, is not right. All the yearly feast days were not Sabbaths. *Leviticus 23:4*. Then *verse 38*, there is a distinction. Again, that righteousness is without the law, I have admitted. Righteousness is by faith in Jesus Christ, because all have sinned. When we have faith in Jesus Christ, we are under grace.*PSDS 110.1*

I am not satisfied with the criticism of my opponent on *Romans 2*. He says, in effect, that one was condemned by *the* law and one by a *law*. No one would infer that there is any such thing in the text. The substance of the law was to be written on their hearts. The nations beside the Jews had such a knowledge of this law that their consciences would tell them what was right and what was wrong. Does the apostle say, whatsoever the *law* says to the Jews and a *law* says to the Gentiles? No such thing.*PSDS 110.2*

Last of all, my opponent thinks by bringing up *Romans 7*, he has brought me to a *dead set*. Well, I supposed it was my privilege to take just as many of the chapters in Rom., as I saw fit, and I did so. We both consider the book of Romans very good authority on this question. But he cites to Campbell and Whiting. Now, I affirm that it does not depend upon the will or law of the husband, whether a woman be an adulteress or not, but upon the law of God. According to my opponent's view of this subject, there is only a very slight difference between us and the favored ones of the old dispensation, who were allowed to marry as many women as they chose, and put away their wives at pleasure. But what does Whiting say? [Reads.]

Now, what does the next chapter say? 1st verse, etc.*PSDS 110.3*

I would say to my friends here, that these frequent interruptions embarrass me. My strength of body almost failed me before I got here, and it is exceedingly embarrassing as well as fatiguing to be interrupted as I have been during my last two speeches.*PSDS 110.4*

My opponent has denied that obedience to any one promise or command would ensure eternal life, but I have not time to collate and compare scripture. There are many points on which I would like to dwell, but it is not possible for me to do so in the time allowed me. I shall, therefore, be under the necessity of leaving them untouched.*PSDS 110.5*

[Mr. Stephenson, rising said;]—He said that according to my view it was left to the will of the husband to have as many wives as he chose, and I would like to have him show how that is to be fairly inferred from my remarks. When I see him so cramped for time, I do not think it out of place in me to offer him all the time he wishes. I would be glad to have him continue if he feels so disposed. He can have the time, and I will add that, as far as I am concerned, if *any of his friends* have any argument that they would like to bring before the people on this subject they can, also, have time.*PSDS 111.1*

[Mr. Waggoner, resuming:] My time is up and I will not occupy more now.*PSDS 111.2*

THIRTIETH SPEECH

Mr. Stephenson in the Affirmative.—It is with some reluctance that I commence summing up, for it is the wish of all my friends that the discussion shall continue. I wish that we might have some reference to future time, and I think the question before us will not be fully discussed without it, but I presume I could not get my opponent to consent to a continuance of the debate longer than has been before stated. It, therefore, devolves, upon me to sum up my opponents argument as well as my own, and leave the people to draw their own inferences. The question is: "Resolved, that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment," etc. I proposed that it should be written *during* the present age, but they of the affirmative opposed that term, and, therefore, by the conditions of the question it might go on to all eternity. This, of course, my opponent has not argued nor proved.*PSDS 111.3*

In his first speech he declared that the reason why God sanctified the seventh day, was because He rested on it from the creation of Heaven and Earth. In his second lecture, he took the position that the *persons*, for whom the Sabbaths of the fourth commandment was instituted, was *man*. And I affirmed that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was instituted by the giving of the fourth commandment; therefore, the conclusion to which we must come, is that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was not observed nor enjoined before the giving of the fourth commandment, at the wilderness of sin. This, therefore, disposes, or should dispose of the first part of our propositions. But my opponent has occupied the whole of the first day and a good part of to-day, in going back to creation and down to Romans.*PSDS 111.4*

As to his manner of reasoning, I must say that I consider it very peculiar. I will give you an example of it. The Sabbath of the Lord was made at creation; the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the Sabbath of the Lord; therefore, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation. The Sabbath was made for man: therefore, the Sabbath was made for man at creation. Twice in the course of his remarks, he has admitted that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was not the *identical day* on which God rested, and of course, it could not have been the *Rest Day*, strictly

speaking of the Lord, for the Lord certainly rested on the seventh day of the creation week.*PSDS 112.1*

Now, the question is, when did the Lord appoint the seventh day or Sabbath of the fourth commandment, for man's observance? God could not be the God of Abram until there was an Abram. Just so the Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not be, until there was a fourth commandment. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment could not exist before the time of the promulgation of that commandment. The true issue between us is this: When did God, by the fourth commandment, require the observance of the seventh day as a Sabbath? I showed you that the Lord enjoined the seventh day at the wilderness of sin, and that was the *first place* at which the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was recognized. Therefore, during the 2500 years of the world's history, preceding the giving of the manna at the wilderness of sin. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was never transgressed or broken, because it was not in existence. In all the history of mankind previous to that time, we have no instance of Sabbath-breaking recorded. We have no indication that any Sabbath was known or observed, and yet, they of the affirmative think they can see that because God rested on the seventh day after creation: therefore, man observed it for 2500 years afterwards, or till the giving of the commandments at Mt. Sinai.*PSDS 112.2*

I showed that Matthew used the adverb *even*, instead of *also*. "The son of man is Lord *even* of the Sabbath day." *Matthew 12:8*. My opponent has not shown that the original in *Mark 2:28*, might not be thus rendered. But we must interpret Matt. by Mark; but why not interpret Mark by Matthew? Does the adverb also change the meaning of the sentence? It certainly does not destroy the force of the statement. "Wherefore, the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath," as a conclusion from the promise that "the Sabbath was made for the man"*PSDS 113.1*

I can show a number of places where the indefinite word, man, is applied to the children of Israel, but it is *the* man in the original. And I have been told that in the Greek language, *all* nouns are preceded by an article. I am not a Greek scholar, however, and will not attempt to say whether my informant is correct or not.*PSDS 113.2*

I affirm that the reason why God selected the seventh day, was because He rested on that day from the work of creation. But the reason why He commanded man to Sabbatize on that day, was because He had delivered them from Egyptian bondage. God does not give as a reason why man shall rest on the seventh day, because He rested on the seventh. *Deuteronomy 5:15*. Here we have the reason for the observance of the fourth commandment's Sabbath. Why was it enjoined? Because the *children of Israel* had been delivered from Egyptian bondage. My opponent has continually overlooked this definite reason for the observance of the fourth commandment, altogether, and, hence his argument on this point have been irrelevant from first to last. The question was on the fourth commandment's Sabbath. Was it instituted at creation? But he has failed to show that there was any fourth commandment at all, till after the children of Israel were delivered from Egyptian bondage, hence there could not have been a fourth commandment's Sabbath till after that time.*PSDS 113.3*

Exodus 34:13, etc. I call upon my opponent to show that *any* Sabbath typified Jesus Christ. If he will do so, I will show that the seventh day typified Christ in the same way.*PSDS 113.4*

But now I come to the last part of our proposition: "the precept to observe it" (the Sabbath of the fourth commandment,) "extends through the present age." He has failed to show one single precept to observe any Sabbath at all, "through the present age." In the entire New Testament, he cannot show one such a precept. We do not find in the whole New Testament, one single precept or commandment to observe the Sabbath, and in fact, the teachings of the Apostles are directly the reverse of this. Paul, the great Apostle to the Gentiles, never once called upon them to observe a Sabbath at all, but placed all days upon a perfect equality. How did he show the perpetuity of the ten commandments? He went to Romans and there he found a law spoken of in connection with sin: therefore, it was the ten commandments. I showed that man was justified by faith in Jesus Christ. Make Christ the great Head of the church: make the church His body: make the church His bride, and is there anything to hinder His being a great law-giver also? I showed that the ten commandments are not enjoined by Christ, but that the commandments of Christ are our law. I proved that the ten

commandments were a covenant with the children of Israel, and that this covenant has been done away; that the death of the law of *Romans 7*, releases the church from its obligation to Moses. I showed the law; of which Paul speaks in Galatians, was added 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant, and was only to continue till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.*PSDS 113.5*

Now, about *2 Corinthians 3*. It was the ministration that was glorious: this my opponent admits. I now call upon him to read the 8th, 9th and 10th verses consecutively. I affirm that it was the ministration that was done away. Even if I should acknowledge that death was not the ministration, how is it that my opponent should overlook the plain reading of the 27th verse? Let him or any one of his friends rise up in this tent and say that it is *death* instead of *ministration* that was written in stones. It was the *ministration* of condemnation written in stones that was done away. Here is one text to show conclusively to any unprejudiced mind, that the ten commandments were abolished. It is declared that what was written on the tables of stone was the *ministration* and that the ministration "was done away—abolished;" therefore, the commandments which were all that were written upon stones were done away; were abolished. Is not this positive testimony?*PSDS 114.1*

Matthew 5. But mark, here, that my opponent did not deny that the ten commandments were *included in* the old Jewish law. The ten commandments were not *the* law, but only a part of it. Now, that was the smallest commandment to which Jesus referred. He quoted the sixth and seventh, but I would think they were both great ones. Why argue that a part of the law is perpetuated and not the rest?—That some of the commandments constituting the law are to be observed and not others? The reasoning of my opponent, if it proves what he claims for it would not only show the perpetuity of the *ten* commandments, but of *all others*. I hope and believe my opponent will not misrepresent me in his last speech, as I cannot reply. I affirm that not one of the ten commandments teaches that man should do unto others as he would have them do unto him, therefore, they are not a perfect moral code.*PSDS 114.2*

My friends take the Bible for your guide. If my opponent has produced Bible evidence in favor of the affirmative of this question.

Believe it. But be not deluded by all his similar and statements from Webster. Take them all and put them into one scale and then place the arguments and Scripture that I have advanced, into the other. Then see which will go up and which will go down. I am still and always hope to be open to conviction, but I cannot see that he has introduced a single Bible passage to show the truth of the affirmative of our proposition. Where has he referred you to one single text showing the perpetuity of the obligation to observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment? If it is in the notes of any friends, either on the right hand or the left, I hope you will show it to me before I leave, that I may not misrepresent this discussion. Has he ever given a successful inference or implication in favor of the affirmative? I denied that the ten commandments are a law. He has come to the conclusion that the ten commandments are a covenant, and the law is a covenant; therefore, the ten commandments are a law. We deny the force of this inference. I can point you back to the day when the fourth commandment's Sabbath was instituted. I can also show you the limitation that was attached to it. It was given to the children of Israel and was to continue "throughout their generations" or till the seed should come. And you will find by reference to 2nd Chron. that all the Sabbaths of the old dispensation, and there were several, were called Sabbaths of the Lord. Are we, therefore, to conclude that they were all made at creation?*PSDS 115.1*

THIRTY-FIRST SPEECH

Mr. Waggoner in the Affirmative.—Beloved friends, I am happy for one thing, that we have got along so pleasantly in this discussion. I think we have got along very pleasantly, indeed, for two persons of such positive temperament. I am, also, very thankful for the good order that has been preserved during the entire discussion. It speaks well for the people of Crane's Grove. Although it has been asserted that I have failed to take a position on one point of the question, and have, therefore, failed to establish its truth, I think the perpetuity of the fourth commandment Sabbath through the present age, has been very fairly shown by the various New Testament scriptures I have quoted. But I did not suppose that the discussion was to close so soon, and as long as it lasted I supposed it was my privilege to discuss the question as I saw fit. Some of my most important arguments my opponent has never noticed at all, and, in fact, it seems as though he could not content himself to be bound by any of the usual rules governing debates. He would bring in arguments and then complain that I was not there before him, whereas, I, being on the affirmative side of the question, had the privilege of choosing my own rate of advance.*PSDS 116.1*

I shall not, therefore, attempt to sum up all the arguments of my opponent, nor the various positions taken by him, but shall show the subject as I think it stands before this congregation.*PSDS 116.2*

I assume that the Sabbath mentioned or enjoined in the fourth commandment and the Sabbath of the Lord are identical. The Sabbath of the Lord was made at creation. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the Sabbath of the Lord. Therefore, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation.*PSDS 116.3*

Now, about the fourth commandment as recorded in *Deuteronomy 5:14, 15*. I contend that the pronoun "it," refers to something at the creation. If the Sabbath of the Lord was a thing 2000 years past, why, command man to observe it?—why, command man to work six days and rest the seventh? I have been willing, from the beginning, to rest the question on just such plain arguments as these "in it"—that is, in the Sabbath of the Lord, "thou shalt not do

any work," etc.*PSDS 116.4*

My opponent contended that "the Sabbath was made for man," "should read, for the man" "or for the Son of Man." Therefore, the Son of the man is Lord, also, of the Sabbath day. If we accept that translation in the one case, we must in the other. Then we have got, not only the first Adam, but the second Adam. The Sabbath was made for the first Adam as well as the second.*PSDS 116.5*

Again, he brings up the word also. This is Mr. Newton's house, he also resides in it. He should have said, this is Mr. Newton's house: This is also the house of Mr. Newton.*PSDS 117.1*

I have claimed that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was set apart from creation, before the covenant was made at Horeb. And the ten commandments were the covenant of God which is plainly the covenant to be kept through a thousand generations.*PSDS 117.2*

Beyond this. I wish to go in my argument, and show [something ruled out as not in order.—Reporter]—,but because they would not keep the law, the kingdom should be taken from them, and give to another. Now, I do not suppose that my opponent will assume that the Savior was here speaking of the New Testament law, for he has himself stated that reference was made to the old dispensation. *Matthew 2*. I would like to compare some passages in the Old and New Testaments, but the point has not been noticed at all, and I forbear.*PSDS 117.3*

My opponent has argued that some, if not all the principles of the old law were incorporated into the new, and yet he affirms that we are not under obligation to keep any of the old precepts, especially the fourth. I say, I glory in the fact that Jesus came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill. I do not argue justification by the law. The carnal mind is removed by Christ, and it is by faith in Him that we are kept from disobedience.*PSDS 117.4*

The law is not made void by Christ, neither has it expired by limitation. I think the Apostle Paul clearly proves the perpetuity of it.*PSDS 117.5*

One *class* had the law written for them upon tables of stone, and one class had the law or its principles written on their hearts. They will both be judged by the same law in the day when they shall be judged by their God. Both reach forward in their consequences to the judgment day.*PSDS 117.6*

I have, also, referred to the argument of the Apostle James, that he refers to the same law that Paul does in Romans, for he makes use of the same quotation from—. We have got a law in both Testaments that says do not kill, and, it also says, do not commit adultery. This law is plainly referred to throughout all the Apostle James' writings, and my opponent has never invalidated it in the least. 1I stated when I reached the question, by my opponent above referred to, that James explicitly defines the Royal Law. *James 2:8*. "If ye fulfill the Royal Law according to the Scriptures, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. ye do well." The plain word of the Lord being the only evidence, this matter is forever settled. j. m. s. He introduces——into the kingdom of heaven and then takes up that law and quotes from it. The argument I based upon James, has not had a single word said against it—not one word of fault found with the conclusion I drew. The Apostle James says the same as Matthew. Whosoever offends in one point, is guilty of a breach of the whole law. He, also, refers it forward to the judgment. All of the New Testament writers refer forward to the final judgment.*PSDS 117.7*

It has been said that a general declaration was destroyed by a limitation. I have denied it and I deny it still. There was a people brought out of the land of Egypt, therefore the law was given. Let us apply the same to the prophets. There was a people brought out of the land of Egypt—therefore the prophets foretold that a Savior should come.*PSDS 118.1*

We understand that God is Supreme and yet we have a limitation. "He is the Lord thy God." Will my opponent argue thus?*PSDS 118.2*

Very many arguments might have been advanced on both sides, that have not: The subject is by no means exhausted, and it is one of the greatest in the whole Bible. In coming to a conclusion at this point in our investigations we do not claim that all the arguments of either side, have been exhausted.*PSDS 118.3*

I would advise you, as my opponent did in his last speech, to search the scriptures, for an error will never sanctify us or fit us for God's kingdom. Truth alone can do this. We do not blame our friends of the negative for being tenacious on this point of the Sabbath, and they must not blame us for being tenacious also. We believe that the whole gospel plan of salvation is suspended upon this point. No government can exist without a law. [Stephenson, gives notice that he shall reply to this.—Reporter.] If there ever was a moment when the law of God was abolished or suspended in its operations, then, I say, there was no government. There can be no government without law. And we ask you to carefully investigate this subject and see whether the principles that bound man to his Maker, before Jesus Christ suffered and died, were ever abrogated; Whether they were set aside by the coming of Christ into the world. God is love, and because He is love, He gave His own Son to die for man. Because man was under condemnation for disobeying God's law, He would sooner give His own Son, to suffer and die upon the cross, than to abrogate that law or permit man to perish.*PSDS 118.4*

I can say, that on personal considerations for myself, I rather hail the close of this discussion with joy than the beginning. As I remarked before, my bodily strength is not sufficient to warrant a longer continuance of the debate.*PSDS 119.1*

I can but thank the audience for their uniformly good deportment. We find that all controversies, and more especially *religious* controversies, frequently cause the passions of men to rise beyond control. Religious wars, or wars caused by the different religious opinions, are always characterized by the greatest cruelty. Again, we would express our gratitude for your kind and respectful attention. I do not expect to return here very soon, i ever. I would, therefore, take an affectionate farewell of this people, and I pray that God may sanctify you all through His truth. May we all enter into the spirit of the word we read and be "wise unto salvation."*PSDS 119.2*

Mr. Stephenson: I see that I am very hoarse, but I wish to reply to the new point which my opponent brought up in his last speech.*PSDS 119.3*

I conceive that there was no labyrinth or period of time between one dispensation and the other. Christ created His law before, and it took effect at his death.*PSDS 119.4*

About the article “the,” I have been informed that it is prefixed to all Greek nouns, but when it would destroy the sense by rendering it into English, the translation omitted it. I will read two texts: *Deuteronomy 5:24*. Here the word man was limited to the twelve tribes of Israel. *Psalm 78:24, 25*. It is thus limited.*PSDS 119.5*

Mr. Andrews, (I think,) rose and said: It requires but little knowledge of the Greek language, to show that all nouns are not preceded by an article. I hold in my hand a Greek Testament, and a great many nouns, both common and proper, with no article prefixed.*PSDS 119.6*

Mr. Stephenson: I merely said I was told so, and it was by a person who pretended to have a good knowledge of Greek.*PSDS 120.1*

mr. waggoner: And I would remark that I was told by a person in the same vicinity, that there were no articles at all in the Greek language. I guess we will have to let one statement balance the other.*PSDS 120.2*

Mr. Stephenson: I think perhaps we will.*PSDS 120.3*

Mr. Waggoner: No, I was mistaken, it was in reference to another language—the Hebrew, I believe.*PSDS 120.4*

[And so ended the discussion—Reporter.]*PSDS 120.5*

[From the Prophetic Expositor and Bible Advocate.]*PSDS 121.1*

DEBATE ON THE SABBATH

To the Church of God scattered abroad, greeting:*PSDS 121.2*

Having attended a debate between Elders J. M. Stephenson and J. H. Waggoner, I will endeavor to give a brief sketch of the main position taken during the discussion, by the disputants.*PSDS 121.3*

Elders Howell and Inghram were chosen Moderators.*PSDS 121.4*

Opened by prayer.*PSDS 121.5*

QUESTION DEBATED

"*Resolved*, That the sabbath of the fourth commandment was given at creation, and that the precept to observe it extends through the present age."*PSDS 121.6*

Elder Waggoner, having taken the affirmative, opened the debate with the following arguments in support of his side of the question:*PSDS 121.7*

1. The ten commandments are recognized in both Testaments.*PSDS 121.8*

2. The term Sabbath signifies rest.*PSDS 121.9*

3. God made the seventh day His Sabbath by resting that day; and*PSDS 121.10*

4. Because He rested, He blessed and sanctified it.*PSDS 121.11*

Conclusion: The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is emphatically declared to be God's rest-day; God's rest-day was made, or originated, at creation; therefore, the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made at creation.*PSDS 121.12*

The institution of the Sabbath is founded upon immutable and unchangeable facts, viz: the creation of heaven and earth in six days, and the rest of Jehovah on the seventh day. *Exodus 20:8-11*. *Exodus 16*. shows the existence of the Sabbath antecedent to its publication on the Mount. By comparing the 4th and 28th verses of this chapter, it will be seen that the law regulating the Sabbath existed anterior to the giving of the manna at the wilderness of Sin.*PSDS 121.13*

Elder Stephenson replied on the negative—*PSDS 121.14*

1. The first thing to be proved in this debate is the Origin of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment—not the origin of the Sabbath of the Lord—not when the Lord rested, but when did He command man to observe a day answering to His rest day.*PSDS 121.15*

The obligation enforced by the fourth commandment could not exist antecedent to the fourth commandment; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. Paul and John.*PSDS 121.16*

The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was made just as the annual Sabbaths and the feast days were made, i.e. by enforcing its observance by precept. It devolves on the affirmative to show that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment (that is, the fourth commandment's Sabbath) was made, i.e., commanded at creation. We must have plain Bible statements. The Sabbath was given to man at the wilderness of Sin. *Exodus 16:5, 29*.*PSDS 121.17*

2. "The term Sabbath signifies rest." I will not take issue. I admit it.*PSDS 122.1*

3. "God made the seventh bay His Sabbath by resting that day." True. But the *origin* of the Lord's Sabbath has nothing to do with the *origin* of the fourth commandment's Sabbath.*PSDS 122.2*

2. "And because He rested He blessed and sanctified it." This statement I endorse also. But what does it prove? Ans. It proves that the original *reason* why God blessed and sanctified the seventh day was not, as will be argued by my opponent, because He designed it for man's observance; but because He rested.*PSDS 122.3*

5. "The Sabbath of the fourth commandment was God's rest day: God rested at creation." My opponent confounds the reason why the seventh day of the week was selected in preference to any of the other days, with the reason why the fourth commandment was given. God laid the commandment on the seventh day, *because* it was His rest day; but the grand original reason why He commanded the children of Israel to observe a weekly Sabbath at all, was that they "were servants in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord God brought them out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm, *the Lord their God commanded them to keep the Sabbath day*." *Deuteronomy 5:15*. This reason harmonizes with the Bible account of the origin of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. *Exodus 16:5, 20*. "See for that the Lord hath given you (who? Adam? Certainly not: but the children of Israel) the Sabbath; therefore, He giveth *you* on the sixth day, the bread of two

days."*PSDS 122.4*

The sixth day here is reckoned from the first day of the giving of the manna; and the seventh day, the day following. Why, then, go back to creation? Could God give the people represented by the pronoun *you* the Sabbath 2,500 years before they existed?*PSDS 122.5*

The Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel. See *Exodus 31:13-17*.*PSDS 122.6*

6. "The fact of creation in six days, and the rest of God the seventh day, eternal and immutable." Admitted. But what does that prove in regard to the origin of the fourth commandment, or the duty of man to observe the Sabbath enforced by it? The fact of Adam being forbidden to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is eternal, but does that prove the perpetuity of the Adamic law through the present age?*PSDS 122.7*

The facts of the tenth day of the seventh month and the fourteenth day of the first month existed from creation; but does that prove that the institutions founded upon those facts were made at creation, or originated synchronously with those facts?*PSDS 122.8*

The fact of the fore-ordained existence of the Lord's rest day by no means proves that it was enforced by the fourth commandment before there was any fourth commandment.*PSDS 122.9*

The above is a summary of the main position taken in the first part of the discussion. During most of the first day Elder Waggoner entrenched himself in the foregoing positions which he evidently considered his stronghold; and would not lead out, hence much time was lost in useless repetitions, until Elder Stephenson finally undertook to prove the negative.*PSDS 122.10*

It is due Elder Waggoner to here say that he moved slowly and with due caution; and that from first to last the best of order was maintained, and the best of feeling prevailed. And I am happy to be able to say the debate has resulted in a firm reliance on the plain word of the Lord, according to its literal interpretation as the only sure basis of faith; and positive testimony as the only sound rule of interpretation.*PSDS 123.1*

I came to the debate with a full determination to hear it through, and then decide according to the weight of evidence, without regard to pre-conceived views or prejudices; and as the debate will be published, and I have not space in the letter to do justice to either party, I will briefly give a few of the arguments which of themselves are sufficient to decide the entire question in my own mind. And,*PSDS 123.2*

1st. *Deuteronomy 5:15* plainly states the reason why, and the time when the Sabbath was commanded. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; *therefore* the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath."*PSDS 123.3*

Again, *Exodus 31:13*, is equally positive and definite. "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations." Read also the 17th verse.*PSDS 123.4*

In looking over my notes, I cannot as an honest man before God, see how anything could be more plainly proved than that the entire law by which the Israelites were governed, including the ten commandments, were abolished. The law was 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant. *Galatians 3:17*. "It was added because of transgressions *till* the seed should come to whom the promise was made," *Verse 19*. "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. But after that *faith is come*, we are no longer under the schoolmaster," (i.e. no longer under the law,) *verses 24, 25*.*PSDS 123.5*

The ten commandments are positively declared to be God's covenant. *Deuteronomy 4:12, 13*; *Exodus 34:27*.*PSDS 123.6*

1st. This covenant was not made with the fathers, but with the identical children of Israel who were brought up out of the land of Egypt. *Deuteronomy 5:3, 4*.*PSDS 123.7*

Paul declares in the most explicit language, that the covenant (i.e. the ten commandments) was cast out, was faulty, had waxed old, and was ready to vanish away. *Galatians 4:21-30*; *Hebrews 8:7-13*.

9:1-4, 14-22. *10:1*.*PSDS 123.8*

Again, *2 Corinthians 3:7*, is positive evidence that the ten commandments were abolished. At the 9th verse, Paul showed that the two ministrations were the two things contrasted: “For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory.” At the 10th verse he declares that the first ministration was done away, and the second remained. “For if that (i.e. that ministration) which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious. At the 13th verse, he tells us that it was abolished; and at the 7th verse that this ministration was written and engraven in stones. “But if the ministration of death written and engraven in stones was glorious,” etc.*PSDS 123.9*

On *Romans 7*. it was argued—*PSDS 124.1*

1st. That the husband is the law-giver, and that the death of the husband releases the wife from the law of her husband. *Verses 2, 3*; *Ephesians 1:21-23*; *5:22-32*.*PSDS 124.2*

2nd. That Moses and Christ were the two husbands. *Hebrews 3:1-6* was referred to as proof: “Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, etc. But Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we, that is, the church.*PSDS 124.3*

Again, *Deuteronomy 18:18, 19*; *Acts 3:22*; *7:37*, were quoted to prove that Moses and Christ were the heads and law-givers by Divine appointment for the government of the church in the Jewish and Christian dispensation. And (3) that Christ is the living head and law-giver of his church (i.e. his bride,) which is his body. *Romans 7:4, 6*. Also that the son of the bond-woman could not be heir with the son of the free-woman, and that consequently his children had to be cast out to make way for the children of the free-woman. Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath

made us free. Amen.*PSDS 124.4*

I would say, it is due my Sabbath-keeping brethren to say that they treated Bro. Stephenson with christian courtesy and kindness.*PSDS 124.5*

Dear brethren, how it behooves us to search the Scriptures for ourselves, in these days of deception and peril, and be sure that all our conclusions are based upon the positive testimony of God's word. May we more than ever cling to God's truth as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, that we may be sanctified by the same, through Jesus Christ, who is our life-giver. Amen.*PSDS 124.6*

We, the undersigned, having taken notes of the debate on the Sabbath between Elds. Waggoner and Stephenson, held at Crane's Grove, Illinois. We believe the Report of R. Chown is a true Report of said Debate as given through the expositor.*PSDS 124.7*

Eld. J. Howell,

Dr. S. Jacobs.